DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 184	HE 015 705

AUTHOR	Parelius, Robert James
TITLE	College Professors: Their Work and Its Discontents.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
GRANT	NIE-G-81-0059
NOTE	213p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Biology; Business Administration Education; *College Environment; *College Faculty; Departments; *Educational Sociology; Enrollment Trends; *Faculty College Relationship; Higher Education; History; Institutional Characteristics; *Interprofessional Relationship; Organizational Theories; Peer Relationship; Political Science; Private Colleges; Scholarship; State Colleges; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*Collegiality

ABSTRACT

Basic problems associated with the role of college faculty, working conditions and situational adjustments, and interpersonal relationships are investigated. Unresolved problems and the social structural circumstances that generate and perpetuate them are also examined. The sociological literature regarding the potential problems in academic work is reviewed, and the results of surveying faculty in the fields of history, political science, biology, and business economics are examined. Four categories of problems are identified: professional, organizational, collegial, and client. Professional problems derive from the limitations of graduate training and professional organizations, while organizational problems stem from the fact that college professors are not free professionals, but employees who work within complex, formal organizations. Collegial problems arise because professors within departments, and sometimes between departments, are dependent upon one another. Client problems exist because professors must interact frequently and directly with students and because student opinions and actions may influence the professor's careers. Interviews were conducted and the Potential Problems Inventory was administered to faculty members from the four departments in both a private college and state college. Among the findings was that enrollment economics pose the most acute problem facing these college professors today. There appears to be a shift from the traditional academic ethos to a market ethos, which threatens the usual patterns of relationship between professor and the discipline, the college, the students, and colleagues. A bibliography, questionnaire, and interview schedule are appended. (SW)

ED223184

COLLEGE PROFESSORS:
THEIR WORK AND ITS DISCONTENTS

by

Robert James Parelius, Ph.D.

Rutgers University
September 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert James
Parelius
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 015 705

COLLEGE PROFESSORS:
THEIR WORK AND ITS DISCONTENTS*

by

Robert James Parelius, Ph.D.

Rutgers University
September 1982

*This material is based upon work supported by the National Institute of Education under grant number NIE-G-81-0059. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute or the Department of Education.

Copyright 1982. All Rights Reserved. Do not quote without the written permission of the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

CHAPTER I. COMMITMENT AND COMPROMISE 1

Theoretical Perspectives: Professional commitments, definition of the work situation, situational adjustments, collegial relationships. Research Strategies: analytical procedures, institutional profiles, departmental profiles.

CHAPTER II. THE PROBLEMS: PROFESSIONAL COMMITMENTS AND THE REALITIES OF THE ACADEMIC WORKPLACE 22

Professional problems: trained capacities & incapacities, teaching as a semi-professional activity, publish and flourish, circumscribed career horizons, the Old Guard vs. the Young Turks. Organizational problems: insularity and parochialism, managed professionalism, enrollment economics, problematic goals. Collegial problems: rate busters, slackers, charlatans and moonlighters; freedom and isolation. Problems with students: ideal student/real student, batch processing, influential amateurs.

CHAPTER III. HISTORIANS 41

Conceptions of professionalism; definitions of the situation; situational adjustments; summary and conclusions

CHAPTER IV. POLITICAL SCIENTISTS 77

Private College: departmental cohesion and work groups; mixed organizational messages, problems and adjustments. State College: the department as a work group, organizational problems and adjustments.

CHAPTER V. BIOLOGISTS 101

The Private College Biology Department: professional standards, the enrollment picture. The State College Biology Department: informal work groups, organizational frustrations, situational adjustments, truncated careers.

CHAPTER IV. BUSINESS ECONOMISTS 127

The State College Business Economists; Private College Business Economists.

Chapter VII. NURTURING THE ACADEMIC ETHOS 145

The problems with teaching undergraduates in perspective: professional problems, organizational problems, problems with student/clients, problems in collegial relations. From the academic to the market ethos: responses to enrollment declines, the role of the colleague group, the importance of leadership. The happy college professor.

APPENDIX 185

BIBLIOGRAPHY 194

PREFACE

Edward Shils has defined the "academic ethos" as ". . . the obligation to teach and learn at the highest levels of which the teacher and student are capable (1977: 176-77)." This is a fine, succinct statement of the college professors' most basic and general professional commitment. It captures the essence of the matter -- the striving to meet lofty standards of excellence regarding cognitive achievement.

We believe that the vast majority of professors begin their academic careers determined to pursue excellence in teaching and scholarship. But the truth is that many are finding it increasingly difficult to keep those commitments. They feel pressured to make compromises. And they often do reluctantly lower their standards in order to meet situational exigencies.

This is a report on the college professor's work today. It is built upon professors' own descriptions of what they do and why they do it. It aims to enlighten the reader about the manifold difficulties which adademicians face and the individual and collective adaptations they make. Hopefully, this will engender a more general empathetic understanding of their situation and contribute to the development of policies which will make it easier for them to sustain high academic ideals.

There is a real need at present to increase public understanding of the professors' work and it's discontents. Earlier volumes have contributed to a negative public conception. Professors have been portrayed as being spoiled, comical, vindictive and cynical. The central issue of ethical commitment has been largely ignored. Thus, one aim of the study is to engender in the reader a sympathetic understanding of academic work. But encouraging empathy does not imply blindness to deviant behaviors. Rather than condeming professors who inflate grades, minimize course preparations or expend lots of energy on sidelines, we attempt to understand the social structural circumstances which generate such norms and behavior. The study proceeds on the assumption that if we can identify the social contexts which sustain high levels of professional commitment and those which undermine it, the empirical and conceptual groundwork will have been laid for a reconsideration of academic policies.

The clash between academic and market values poses severe problems for college professors, their institutions and their students. Caught between their professional commitments on the one hand and the necessity of maintaining student enrollments on the other, professors are being pressured to make compromises. And their adjustments to shifting enrollment patterns have been made more difficult because the underlying issues have not been articulated and openly discussed. Hopefully this research will provoke the sort of public debate which is necessary in order to prevent the erosion of academic ideals by market forces.

This is one of the first empirical studies which deals with the ways in which the immediate social contexts within which college professors work actually effect their teaching practices. Previous research on college teaching has been done mostly by educational psychologists (Lee 1967; McKeachie 1970; McKeachie and Kulik 1975). Their individualistic and microscopic approach has drawn their attention to personality characteristics and classroom dynamics while distracting them from a consideration of collegial influences.

But the sociological literature on higher education is not much more helpful to us because it generally focuses on graduate training and research, not undergraduate teaching; on prestigious, research-oriented colleges and universities, not undistinguished teaching colleges; on formal organization, not informal relationships; on student cultures, not faculty cultures and upon those forces which create and maintain the autonomy and isolation of professors rather than those which draw faculty members together.

Even the sociological studies of teaching in elementary and secondary schools tends to neglect consideration of informal teacher work groups and work norms upon teaching practices. Philosophical differences, lack of a common technical vocabulary and a set of reliably effective instructional techniques, subject matter specialization, restricted opportunity for interaction and instructional isolation within separate classrooms are factors which have been noted as reducing collegial impact. Nonetheless, there have been scattered references to influential collegial relationships among school teachers (Parelius 1980). And we are beginning to understand that school "climate" or "ethos" does effect teaching success.

Because teaching at all levels is a similar process it seems probable that schoolteachers and college professors have a great deal in common. But again it must be emphasized that we are entering largely unexplored territory in this investigation. The need for research which focuses on the social contexts of college teaching have been noted (Mann, _et_. _al_. 1968: 344), but not acted upon.

In sum a major purpose of this study is to make a contribution to the discipline of sociology. As an exploratory study it will generate materials which describe in detail a variety of the social contexts of undergraduate teaching. By choosing to study faculty within colleges which have only local reputations, we will be investigating these arenas of academic toil for the first time. The research also aims to make a contribution to the sociological study of work in general and teaching in particular. It attempts to do this by testing the generalizability of propositions based on previous studies of other occupations and professions, including schoolteaching. By showing the ways in which classroom instructional practices are influenced by collegial relationships, this research will open up new lines of inquiry.

My debts are numerous. First, there are the professors and administrators of Private College and Public College who so graciously cooperated and gave of their time. Second, the seed money provided by the Rutgers Research Council and the more substantial support from the National Institute of Education. Dr. William Berlin, a professor at a state college himself, provided invaluable input through the middle and final stages of the

analysis, drafted two chapters and edited the others. His insights from personal experiences have enriched the report greatly. Thanks are also due to Kathe Nixon, an undergraduate honors student, who worked closely with us in the data analysis and drafted one chapter. Her student perspective often proved helpful and stimulating. Together Bill, Kathe and I struggled to fit the pieces of the puzzle together so that a clear picture of the professors' work and it's discontents was produced. Margie Nolan typed the entire manuscript. Of course, responsibility for the final product with whatever shortcomings it may have is mine, not theirs.

Chapter One

Commitment and Compromise

There can be little doubt that the vast majority of college professors are committed to excellence in teaching and scholarship. But the truth is that many are finding it increasingly difficult to keep those commitments. They feel pressured to make compromises. And they often, albeit reluctantly, lower their standards in order to meet situational exigencies.

This is a report on the college professor's work today. It is built upon professors' own descriptions of what they do and why they do it. It aims to enlighten the reader about the manifold difficulties which academicians face and the individual and collective adaptations they make. Hopefully, this report will engender a more general empathetic understanding of their situation and contribute to the development of policies which will make it easier for them to sustain high academic ideals.

Theoretical Perspectives

This is a sociological analysis of academic standards and the social circumstances under which they are sometimes compromised. It is guided by a few very basic concepts:

professional commitment, definition of the situation, situational adjustment and collegial social support and control. After a brief description of these concepts, the research procedures used in this study will be described.

Professional commitment

College professors are expected to be exemplars of the "academic ethos." That is, they are expected to be committed to the highest possible standards of scholarship and teaching (Shils 1976: 176-7). But not much of a specific nature is known about the social processes through which academic commitment develops.

Academic commitment probably begins in the early grades of elementary school, if not before, and is progressively refined in subsequent years of formal education. Those who decide to become college professors have years of experience as outstanding students and as observers of their own teachers and professors. Often they have been selected and anticipatorily socialized for the role to which they commit themselves as graduate students. While in pursuit of their doctorates they not only master the existant body of theory and research in their fields. They also learn the morality of the academic ethos. The search for truth and the desire to serve students by communicating current conceptions of truth to the next generation -- these are the central goals for which they are taught to strive.

But beyond the consensus on these very abstract principles, there is a great deal of dispute and controversy over the finer points. Within many disciplines there are seemingly endless disagreements over the relative merits of different types of research (i.e. applied vs. basic, quantitative vs. qualitative, labwork vs. fieldwork, value neutral vs. value committed, participant observation vs. theoretical analysis). The operational definition of "scholarship" is also often in dispute. To be judged a true scholar does a professor have to publish in leading journals, give papers at professional meetings and, in general, make significant contributions to the discipline? Or is it enough to read, try to keep up with one's specialized field and concentrate one's intellectual energies on teaching? Further, there are differences both within and between disciplines regarding the goals of undergraduate teaching (i.e. technical mastery vs. moral growth; professional, technical or vocational preparation vs. acquisition of a broad liberal education; motivating academically marginal students vs. concentrating on the best and the brightest). Thus, there is considerable opportunity for conflict between professors whose conceptions of professionalism are at odds -- who disagree about what the highest standards of teaching and learning actually are.

Definition of the work situation

When a new professor assumes professional duties within a given department and college, he or she is confronted with a set of objective working conditions. These objective conditions provide certain opportunities to actualize professional aspirations but they also impose certain limitations on them. At the beginning the newcomer is likely to spend a good deal of time trying to discover as much as possible about these organizational resources and constraints.

But the neophyte will soon recognize that there is a subjective order to academic life which significantly patterns behavior. "If men define situations as real they are real in their consequences (Thomas 1928: 572)." This is the concept of definition of the situation. It calls attention to the fact that human beings individually and collectively endeavor to understand their social situations. They assess objective clues and develop interpretations and beliefs which make sense of those bits and pieces of evidence. When groups of professors discuss these matters over a long period of time they may construct a relatively ordered and coherent understanding of the social contexts of academic professionalism. Building upon the seminal ideas of William Graham Summer (1907) Howard Becker as summarized the key processes:

> A group finds itself sharing a common situation and common problems. Various members of the group experiment with possible solutions to those problems and report their experiences to their fellows. In the course of their collective discussion, the members of the group arrive at a definition of the situation, its problems and possibilities, and develop consensus as to the most appropriate and efficient ways of behaving. This consensus thenceforth constrains the activities of individual members of the group, who will probably act on it, given the opportunity (Becker 1964).

Of course collective problem solving is not only done informally and unofficially. Frequently faculty committees or senates will take up recurrent problems. And unions may choose to take the most serious issues to the bargaining table.

Situational adjustments

Situational adjustment is the process by which an individual alters certain behaviors and/or aspirations often in light of the definitions of the situation which are shared by co-workers. In most cases this is probably a subtle and largely unrecognized process which comes about through casual conversations and observations. However, where situational adjustments are interpreted as representing a lowering of professional standards, it can be a conscious, calculated and painful process. In either case

> The collective character of socialization processes has a profound effect on their consequences. Because the solutions the group reaches have, for the individual being socialized, the character of 'what everyone knows to be true', he tends to accept them.
> (Becker 1964)

Given the low visibility of academic work to colleagues, it is possible that individuals will make their compromises secretly in the isolation of their offices and classrooms. If several members of a group make the same or similar adjustments but do not communicate them to one another, nonconsensual sharing develops. Where colleagues do discuss alterations in their ideals and behaviors, consensual sharing develops (Stebbins 1979: 29). In these latter circumstances commiseration and informal consultation may produce a collective validation of the necessity for compromise and the limits within which it is appropriate. Thus, co-workers may develop shared definitions of their situation and shared norms defining socially acceptable means of dealing with common and recurrent problems. These shared definitions of the situation and informal work norms are central elements of the faculty culture.

Collegial relationships

Because the informal work relationships and occupational cultures of professors who teach undergraduates have not been systematically studied, they were of particular interest here. Such work groups and cultures have been observed in many other occupations and professions, including schoolteaching. Further, there have been some studies of college faculties which partially illuminate the matters of concern here.

The existence and importance of informal groups within bureaucracies has long been recognized. For example, such groups have been found within industrial (Barnard 1938; Roethlisberger and Dickson 1947; Roy 1952; Gouldner 1954), military (Page 1946-47; Shils and Janowitz 1948; Stouffer 1949; Little 1965; Moskos 1970) and professional settings (Blau 1957; Becker, Geer and Hughes 1968; Freidson 1975; Baldridge 1971). Wherever they exist informal work groups develop their own unofficial, yet highly influential, definitions of their work situation and productivity norms. Apparently informal relationships help workers cope with bureaucractic structures by adapting official regulations and creating new standard operating procedures, cutting through red tape, and by providing a sphere of warmth and emotional support which strengthens morale and commitment. In situations where there is uncertainty or risk, lateral relations among workers may also be helpful through encouraging sharing information, problem-solving and provision of social support (March and Simon 1958; Blau and Scott 1962; Perrow 1972; Galbraith 1973). The work group defines means of coping with recurrent problems which are socially acceptable to its members and may provide consensual validation for invididual and collective deviance from official regulations. Extension of these generalizations about informal work relationships to academic departments would appear to be a promising and fruitful step.

Studies of various occupations and professions have also revealed the importance of informal groups and occupational cultures in shaping the perspectives and behavior of workers. Hughes and his associates have found that informal work groups are important to furriers, jazz musicians, medical students and undergraduate students, for example (Hughes 1971). Becker, Geer and Hughes found that Kansas University undergraduates ". . . make a life for themselves in college and the kind of life they create is the most immediate influence upon them (Becker, Geer and Hughes, 1968: 1)." Friedson's study of processes of social control among physicians in group practice found that strong norms of collegial etiquette developed which ". . . discouraged critical attitudes toward colleagues, the communication of critical information to others about the performance of colleagues, and the undertaking of collective social control (1975: 241-42)." Thus, an occupational or professional culture may protect individual autonomy rather than constrain work patterns. Within the academic professions the key value, academic freedom, may serve the same purpose.

Studies of informal organization among schoolteachers do provide useful insights. In many organizational and professional respects the jobs of schoolteachers and college professors are similar. On the one hand the loosely-coupled organization of school and the lack of a common technical culture among educators apparently inhibits the formation of collegial ties (Chesler, Schmuck and Lippitt, 1963: 269-77; Bidwell, 1965: 50; Lortie, 1975: 72-72; Warren, 1975: 139-48; Newberry, 1975). One result is a good deal of ignorance about what methods colleagues are using and why (Newberry, 1975). On the other hand there is evidence that cliques do form among teachers (Waller, 1961; McPherson 1972; Grassie, 1973) and that teachers do learn the ropes and selectively adopt teaching strategies through informal consultations with peers (Hermanowitz 1966; Lortie 1975: 71-81; Levy, 1970). Teachers are not completely isolated from one another by virtue of the fact that they generally work within different classrooms. Official meetings, gatherings in the mimeo room or teacher's room and afterschool activities are all occasions for interaction and the formation of group norms, values and priorities (Warren, 1975). The literature about school teachers contains few descriptive insights about the nature and impact of the faculty work groups and cultures, however.

Most of the sociological literature on higher education suggests that collegiality is extremely thin, especially when it comes to matters involving undergraduate teaching (Jencks and Riesman, 1968; Mann, 1968; Meeth, February 1976). One item from the recent American Council on Education survey reflects upon this issue indirectly. Professors in all types of institutions were asked, "Is your social life primarily with colleagues at this institution?" In two year colleges only 20.8 percent answered in the affirmative. In four-year colleges the percentage rose to 35.4 and in universities it rose still further to 41.0 percent. These data suggest that it is less common for friendship relationships to form among faculty in teaching institutions, although they provide no insight into the reasons for this (Bayer, 1972: 28). In any case the question does not ask about informal work groups and, furthermore, one would not necessarily expect such work groups to dominate one's social life. Ethnographic case studies of newly established and innovative colleges do mention informal work groups and norms in passing, but do not provide much descriptive detail about the dynamics of collegial relationships or the content of faculty teaching cultures (Riesman and Gusfield, 1964; Clark, 1970; Baldridge 1971; Riesman, Gusfield and Gamson, 1975; McHenry 1977; Grant and Riesman, 1978).

Many studies have documented the existence of what might be called subcultural variations between disciplines in terms of basic orientations in undergraduate teaching (Lazarsfeld and Thielens 1958; Gamson 1966; Gusfield and Riesman 1966; Vreeland and Bidwell 1966; Lewis 1967; Moore 1970; Gaff and Wilson 1971; Ladd and Lipset 1975; Liebert and Bayer 1975; Wilson 1975; Stark and Morstain 1978; Thielens 1978). In general as compared to social scientists, natural scientists are relatively conservative, distant from students, and more concerned with technical than moral goals. None of these studies attempted to explore the contributions of socialization, selection and situational adjustment to the process by which these consistent differences emerged. And none considered the ways in which informal collegial relationships help shape these patterns.

Research Strategies

During 1979 a computer assisted search of the social science literature dealing with social relationships and faculty cultures revealed a serious gap in our knowledge (Parelius 1980). Only scattered evidence was available, much of which was methodoligically flawed and/or contradictory. Virtually nothing was found which described the social processes through which schoolteachers and college professors identify their common and recurrent problems, define their work situation and develop normative guidelines to deal with occupational challenges. An exploratory study of these social processes clearly seemed to be in order.

It was decided to start the study in a small, private college where the problems could be expected to be relatively severe. Henceforth the descriptive, though prosaic pseudonym, Private College, will be used in referring to that institution. Within Private College the history department was chosen to represent the humanities which were known to be suffering from sharply declining enrollments. Biological science and political science represented other major divisions. Finally, business economics was included to represent a discipline-based field presumed to be attractive to students because it had clear vocational relevance.

The goal was to collect information from all the full-time members of each of these departments. The department was chosen as the unit of analysis for several reasons. First, the department is the fundamental organizational unit within any college. Its members are at least minimally interdependent and face certain common and recurrent problems. Second, because of the shared professional interests and physical proximity of their members, departments were considered likely loci for the development of close collegial relations. Third, departments are units wherein professional and organizational commitments converge. Thus, any tension between professional ideals and organizational exigencies would likely arise within the departmental context. In short if faculty cultures were to be found, these seemed the most likely places. It was recognized from the outset however, that professional networks often extend beyond the professors' home departments to other departments within the college or, indeed, to other colleges or universities.

Initial interviews were conducted with the members of the Private College history department. Some basic personal and professional background data were gathered but the focus was upon potential problems and the ways in which professors coped with them. The purpose of the Potential Problems Inventory (see Appendix 1) was not primarily to generate quantitative data. Rather it was designed to probe diverse problem areas and stimulate discussions which would illuminate collegial relations and faculty cultures. Minor revisions were eventually made in the interview schedule. In order to maximize the time for open-ended discussion, questionnaires covering background data were developed and distributed and filled out by the respondents prior to the interviews. It became immediately apparant that the data being generated were extremely rich. So I was encouraged to seek funding to replicate the study at a nearby, and to some unknown extent, competitive, college which will be called State College.

In the spring of 1981 funding for the replication was achieved. Interviewing at State College began almost immediately and was completed at the end of that spring semester. At this point we had gathered the data necessary to make comparisons between colleges, between departments within the same disciplines in different colleges, and between departments within colleges.

Although the research sites expanded from three departments in Private College to four departments in both Private College and State College, the procedures remained basically the same. In all cases the primary data were generated by semi-structured interviews. The interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed. Professors were asked to indicate how serious they considered potential problems to be and then how they attempted to resolve them. In addition data were gathered on personal background and professional careers and activities.

Because the study was conceived as a pilot project laying the groundwork for a larger, more comprehensive survey research effort, the research instruments were revised three different times. The resultant diminution of data comparability was balanced by sharper focussing and the need to test new approaches to sensitive topics. For example at State College, several items designed to get at informal norms regarding collegial interaction were added to the Possible Problems Inventory. Certain sociometric questions designed to illuminate interaction patterns were also included.

Analytical procedures

The interview protocols were analyzed first individually and then collectively by a three person research team. We proceeded by systematically comparing the paired Private College and State College departments in history, political science, biology and business economics. We constantly searched for shared perceptions of professionalism, collective definitions of the opportunities and problems posed by the work environment, and patterned situational adjustments.

There is no cut and dried method for identifying these social patterns. In the end we inferred conceptions of professionalism more from statements about what was considered unprofessional than from direct pronouncements of ideals. Definitions of the situation proved less difficult to identify because in most cases the professors within a given department shared a clear sense of their most pressing problems. Somewhat to our surprise these professors were generally quite frank about their individual situational adjustments, even when they might be considered as deviating from official policies. But the professors proved more reticent about collegial relationships, shared norms and processes of social control. Consequently it was frequently impossible to distinguish between consensual sharing based on frequent interaction and nonconsensual sharing which might develop when individuals independently arrive at the same coping procedures (Stebbins 1977: 29).

Our research design facilitated comparisons within and between colleges. And our interviews contained items designed to get at the same problems from different angles. We took full advantage of the abundant opportunities for cross-checking in our efforts to develop valid generalizations.

Our analysis was in some ways like the approach to a jigsaw puzzle, except that we had only a vague pattern to work from and we had to discover and fashion our own pieces as we went along. The findings are generally descriptive and qualitative. We are confident, however, that they are accurate and replicable.

Institutional profiles

In many respects the institutional histories of the two colleges studied are strikingly parallel. Both colleges were founded within the same city as special purpose institutions during the mid-nineteenth century. Private College began as a business school. State College was originally devoted to teacher training. During the boom decades of the 1950's and 1960's both institutions expanded their curricular offerings and attracted increased numbers of students. By the end of that period both colleges had been transformed into four-year, multipurpose colleges and had been relocated on spacious and attractive suburban campuses.

The parallels between these two colleges continue to the present. In recent years administrators at both colleges have attempted to "upgrade" their faculties by emphasizing terminal degrees, research, and scholarly productivity in decisions regarding appointments and promotions. Faculty have reacted to administrative initiatives and the prospect of retrenchment by unionizing. Union leaders have made use of the full range of collective bargaining tactics, including strikes, to protect and improve wages and working conditions.

Finally, both colleges are currently feeling the effects of enrollment declines within their liberal arts divisions. Increasing numbers of students are choosing to major in professional, business or technical fields. Consequently upper division courses in history, biology and political science are often underregistered.

These broad parallels should not obscure the fact that these colleges differ in terms of ownership, support and control. Because Private College has only a meagre endowment and severely restricted state subsidies, it must rely heavily upon tuition payments to meet operating costs. Because State College is a part of a much larger, publicly supported system, and because it is favored by many state legislators, the imperative to maximize tuition income is lacking and there is greater freedom in reacting to enrollment declines. In fact the faculty and administration of State College have embarked upon a program of institutional upgrading despite retrenchment. They have struck a deal with the legislature whereby the college will reduce its teaching staff (largely through attrition) and become more restrictive and selective in admissions in return for a distinctively advantageous state funding formula. Private College professors feel the pressures of declining enrollments much more directly and urgently than State College professors. This is true despite the fact that the faculty of Private College, through the process of collective bargaining, has achieved elaborate safeguards in case of retrenchment.

Departmental Profiles

Some basic descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1 below. Data are presented not only for the departments studied here but also in most cases for faculty who participated in a national survey of academia which was completed twelve years previously (Trow 1975: 7).

Compared to the 1968-69 national sample, the faculty included in this study are: more likely to have attained a Ph.D. or other professional degree, somewhat less likely to be primarily interested in teaching, younger, and quite a bit more professionally active. Because the national survey is now somewhat dated, we cannot know whether these differences between the faculties of Private College and State College, on the one hand, and the "average quality" college faculty nationwide, on the other, would exist today. The difference may reflect a general "upgrading" of faculty as judged by research-centered standards of academic quality.

There are only a few seemingly significant differences in the overall profiles of the four departments within Private College and State College. Private College's faculty are somewhat younger, less likely to have worked previously as a schoolteacher or junior college professor, and are more likely to have a Ph.D. or other professional degree (in fact all do). These differences no doubt reflect State College's past as a teacher's college. Historically the Ph.D., which is a research degree, was not considered necessary at many normal schools. Yet there is practically no difference between the colleges regarding commitment to teaching or level of professional activity. Almost half of the Private College faculty (as compared to only about one quarter of the State College faculty) are upwardly mobile, having been raised in blue collar homes. Yet Public College faculty are much less likely (40 percent as compared with 86 percent) to have spouses who work outside the home.

Insert Table 1 about here

One must be extremely cautious in making comparisons at the department level because the numbers involved are often so very small. Only a few noteworthy differences are apparant. First, half of the State College historians have not completed their doctorates. That is quite unusual. Second, the business economics departments stand out because within them only a minority of faculty express a primary professional interest in teaching. Finally, the biologists are unusually likely to come from white collar backgrounds. Some of these differences will prove

TABLE 1

Faculty Profiles by Department and College in Percentages

Faculty Characteristics	History	Political Science	Biology	Business Economics	Totals	
					Sample College	Average Quality College (1968-69)
Private College						
(N)[a]	(11)	(7)	(5)	(5)	(28)	
Highest degree attained is a Ph.D. or other professional degree	100	100	100	100	100	57
Gender is male	100	86	80	80	89	78
Age is 40 or older	80	42	40	60	55	50[b]
Previous work as a schoolteacher or junior college professor	18	14	00	00	11	NA
Primary professional interest is in teaching rather than research	91	86	75	40	78	88
Professional activity within last two years:						
Published one or more articles or books	82	57	80	80	75	37
Presented paper at professional meeting	80	14	80	20	64	NA
Father's occupation was blue collar	66	66	20	40	47	27
Married, living with spouse	75	71	100	100	83	NA
Spouse is employed outside the home[c]	40	60	40	20	40	NA
State College						
(N)	(10)	(5)	(13)	(4)	(32)	
Highest degree attained is a Ph.D. or other professional degree	50	80	69	100	69	57
Gender is male	100	80	85	25	81	78
Age is 40 or older	90	60	62	100	74	50[b]
Previous work as a schoolteacher or junior college professor	20	20	38	25	28	NA
Primary professional interest is in teaching rather than research	70	75	77	25	68	88
Professional activity within last two years:						
Published one or more articles or books	60	60	54	75	66	37
Presented paper at professionsional meeting	60	60	46	100	59	NA
Father's occupation was blue collar	30	40	17	00	24	27
Married, living with spouse	100	40	69	25	69	NA
Spouse is employed outside the home[c]	80	100	89	00	86	NA

[a] Numbers vary slightly due to no response.

[b] This is actually the percent above the mean age of 41, not 40.

[c] Based on those who are married and living with their spouse.

to be important in interpreting the qualitative materials presented in the following chapters.

Goals of the Research

A primary goal of the research is basically descriptive and didactic. We want college professors, administrators, students and taxpayers to know much more about the basic problems associated with the professor's work today.

At the same time it is our intention to make a contribution to the field of sociology by exploring the social processes of problem definition and resolution. Specifically our findings should add to the specialized knowledge regarding higher educational institutions and the academic professions.

This is policy-oriented research. It aims to enlighten both sociologists and educational decisionmakers. By identifying unresolved problems and the social structural circumstances which generate and perpetuate them, it may be possible to develop innovative and ameliorative policy proposals. Or at least the effort may generate some empathy and compassion for those who must cope as best they can.

In the following chapters we will first review the sociological literature regarding the potential problems in academic work and then describe the actual problems experienced by historians, political scientists, biologists and, finally, by business economists.

Chapter Two

The Problems: Professional Commitments and the Realities of the Academic Workplace

The purpose of this chapter is to review the existant sociological literature regarding the many ways in which the realities of the academic workplace may frustrate dedicated professors. This enumeration of potential problems will serve as a backdrop for our reports on the actual problems faced at Private College and State College.

Four categories of problems are considered. *Professional problems* derive from the limitations of graduate training and professional organizations.[1] *Organizational problems* are those which stem from the fact that college professors are not free professionals, but employees who work within complex, formal organizations. Although some organizational problems are probably common to all institustions of higher education, others are likely to be distinctive to undergraduate teaching colleges. *Collegial* problems arise because professors within departments, and to a less widely recognized extent, between departments, are dependent upon one another. The individual professor's autonomy and academic freedom is somewhat constrained by the necessity of working together with colleagues for the benefit of student clients. Finally, client problems exist because professors must interact frequently and directly with students and because student opinions and actions may influence the professor's career.

---

[1] Professional associations such as the American Sociological Association are one type of professional organization, one which is devoted to the advancement of a particular discipline. Another major type, the American Association of University Professors, for example, reaches across disciplines and attempts to improve the common lot of all professors, often through collective bargaining.

Professional Problems

Trained capacities and incapacities

Graduate training is designed to develop the capacity to do significant research. It involves mastering complex and esoteric body of knowledge and state-of-the-art investigatory techniques. Graduate study is not solely concerned with technique and factual knowledge. There is a moral component as well. The degree candidate is expected to be committed to certain ethical standards and to the advancement of the discipline. One is supposed to have high aspirations -- to emulate distinguished professors and to seek national and even international recognition from professional colleagues. Professional recognition is, of course, based on original scholarly contributions.

The basic problem with this is that undergraduate teaching, not research, is the primary and virtually exclusive work of most college faculties (Baldridge 1978: 102). Most colleges are essentially teaching institutions which require professors to teach so many courses and students that research becomes a spare time activity.

Yet prospective professors are not systematically trained to be effective undergraduate teachers. Graduate faculty often do not consider this much of a problem. They argue that those who achieve eminence in their fields on the basis of their original research are almost always effective teachers. Thus, the faculty of doctoral programs concern themselves with the quality of instructional content and largely ignore teaching methods and styles (Heiss 1970: 229). Some, but not all, graduate students are introduced to teaching through teaching assistantships. But these positions are often considered more as a form of financial aide than as a learning opportunity. Teaching assistants are generally quite inadequately supervised and minimally instructed regarding teaching techniques. College professors are the only professionals who are not systematically trained to perform their primary professional duties.

But it is not just that professors are not trained to teach. A more serious charge is that during their years of graduate study many professors actually develop a trained incapacity to excel as undergraduate professors. The primary professional commitment to the advancement of the discipline through research, the emphasis on specialization, and even the scholarly emphasis upon detached observation and abstraction may work against success with undergraduates (Taylor 1979). Certainly the disdain with which graduate students are taught to regard work far from the frontiers of knowledge such as teaching introductory and remedial courses may impair one's effectiveness in teaching such courses (Blackburn 1974: 81). Research oriented professors are likely to consider this the "dirty work" of the profession (Hughes 1971: 343). From their perspective such courses are to be minimized and, if possible, avoided entirely. If one considers time spent on class preparation as time taken away from the more important business of publishing, it is hard to see how this cannot reduce chances for success in reaching out to the uninitiated (Light 1974; Newman 1971; Tussman 1969).

Of course high research productivity and high quality teaching are not necessarily incompatible. In leading universities with strong graduate programs and excellent students, teaching and research may complement one another nicely. In such institutions teaching loads are relatively light, opportunities for teaching in specialized areas relatively plentiful and the students are often challenging and stimulating. However, in the common, undistinguished college research and teaching commitments may often be at odds.

Teaching as a Semi-professional Activity

Many observers have noted that undergraduate teaching has relatively low prestige within the academic profession (Jencks and Riesman 1968; Newman 1971; Ben-David 1972; Cole and Cole 1973; Light 1974; Cottle 1971: 151). In fact, compared to research and publication teaching can be, and has been, characterized as a "semi-professional" activity (Etzioni 1969). The conventional wisdom dispensed in leading graduate programs is that the pedagogical knowledge base is extremely weak. Educational theory and research, though voluminous, is often denigrated and thought to be useless in guiding professional practice (Lortie 1975; Dressel 1976: 353-56). Education is described as an unsettled field within which diverse philosophies, goals and teaching models are vying for general acceptance (Parelius 1980). And educational technology has been characterized as being primitive, uncodified and of uncertain effectiveness (Boocock 1966: 44; Hermanowicz 1966; Jackson 1968: 159-63; Radnor 1974: 12; Lortie 1975: 58-70; Bidwell and Kasarda 1975; Barr and Dreeben 1977; Centra and Potter 1980). The low prestige accorded to education as a discipline within academia no doubt is one reason that training for teaching is minimized within doctoral programs.

But the "semi-professional" categorization regarding teaching is not only tied to a weak knowledge base and minimal formal training. It is also noted that instructional performances are essentially private and sheltered from collegial scrutiny and criticism (Jencks and Riesman 1968; Lortie 1969; Shils 1972; Dreeben 1973). Procedures for the evaluation of undergraduate teaching are generally haphazard and the criteria for evaluation are often arbitrary and/or ambiguous. Sometimes more emphasis is put upon student evaluations of uncertain reliability and validity than upon collegial evaluation (also of uncertain reliability and validity). Faculty insulation within the classroom is reinforced by the central value of academic freedom.

Publish and Flourish

National surveys of professors employed by all kinds of institutions of higher education indicate that many more academics are more interested in teaching than in research (Trow 1975; Baldridge 1978). In fact even in high quality research universities only half of the faculty are more interested in research than teaching (Trow 1975: 44). In less prestigious institutions faculty are much more likely to conceive of themselves as teachers first and researchers second. No doubt this helps explain the fact that historically many professors have neither published nor perished. Few professors ever publish very much beyond what was done as part of their dissertation projects.

Still, there is good evidence that "Publish and flourish" is an appropriate motto throughout most, if not all, of academia. In virtually all institutions, promotions, leadership positions and other rewards flow to those who are relatively prolific scholars. It follows from these observations that the majority who are largely inactive professionally can expect relatively slow career development. There is little evidence that dedication to excellent undergraduate teaching is regularly recognized and rewarded within our colleges.

Circumscribed career horizons

Another set of professional problems stems from the fact that although career aspirations are often high, career opportunities are severely limited. The combined effects of oversupply of academic personnel, stable or declining enrollments, tenuring-in, extension of the mandatory retirement age and inflation have brought a depression to the academic marketplace (Parelius and Parelius, 1978: 209-13; Licklider, 1979). With the advent of retrenchment, the prospects of a new Ph.D. holder for a career within any given college or university have diminished and opportunities for vertical or even horizontal mobility by moving from one institution to another are rapidly disappearing. The limited resources of professional organizations (AAUP, AFT and NEA) are strained by the effort to maintain present wages and working conditions. In fact, the economic position of the American professoriate is eroding. Especially among young, untenured professors, limited career prospects are likely to have a devastating impact upon morale.

The Old Guard vs. the Young Turks

Generational conflict within college faculties has probably always existed (Ladd and Lipset 1975). There is an inevitable tension between those who have tenure and those who do not -- between those who act as gate-keepers and those who are potentially kept out.

But under current conditions that conflict may well be sharper than usual. Resources and opportunities are restricted. And conceptions of adequate professional performance are changing rapidly. At present even remote, backwater colleges find it possible to recruit bright young graduates from distinguished universities. Indeed, the competition for tenure-track positions at little known colleges is often quite intense. The temptation to take advantage of the buyer's market and to improve the scholarly distinction of the faculty must often prove irresistable. The ambitious young academics will often be the idealistic carriers of high professional standards, including commitments to high levels of scholarly productivity. Clashes between the Young Turks who want to make a name for themselves and to reshape the colleges in accordance with their values and the Old Guard who are likely to be rather complacent are to be expected. Because many marginal liberal arts colleges were once either teacher's colleges or vocational schools, many of the original and still working faculty are likely to have been hired with quite different expectations than presently prevail. They were not expected to be scholars in the sense of being up to date on the latest work in their specialized fields or doing original research and publishing. Rather, they were expected to be generalists and teachers. The Old Guard will see the Young Turks as a threat. The Young Turks will see the Old Guard as an impediment or an embarassment. Under such circumstances collegial relationships between the senior and junior faculty may sometimes be severely strained.

Organizational Problems

College professors are not free, self-employed professionals. They are employees who work within complex formal organizations. The prospects for their individual careers are importantly tied to the long-term viability of the colleges which employ them. The sociological literature on institutions of higher education suggests that there are many ways in which formal organizations contexts may affect undergraduate teaching.

Insularity and parochialism

Given the difficulties of landing any academic job these days, ambitious young professors may be grateful to secure employment within obscure colleges. However, as specialists and as people trained to participate in cosmopolitan scholarly networks, they may come to consider themselves cut off from the company of colleagues and students who share their scholarly interests. For example, most small colleges cannot afford to employ more than one molecular biologist. In time the individual filling that curricular niche may come to resent the position of solitary expert and to long for the more intellectually exciting atmosphere of a research university. The morale of such individuals may be heavily dependent upon their ability to maintain a wide-ranging scholarly network despite being employed on the periphery rather than the center of academic life (Shils 1975).

Managed professionalism

With the exception of a few elite liberal arts colleges, teaching institutions tend to have strong administrations and relatively weak faculties (Blau 1973; Baldridge 1978). Although college faculty members are increasingly turning to unions in an effort to gain bargaining power, administrative dominance is common. A pattern of "managed professionalism" prevails with faculty prerogatives being circumscribed by bureaucratic controls (Baldridge 1978: 92-93).

Compared to professors at research universities faculty within such state colleges are likely to experience restricted autonomy. In the public colleges faculty may find their options limited by legislative actions and system-level controls. And in most private colleges traditions of strong administrative control are still in evidence. Unionization may generate sufficient countervailing power to check administrative fiat within private colleges. But collective bargaining seems less likely to be successful within state college systems because the legislature ultimately holds the purse strings. Furthermore, some faculty may feel just as constrained by union contract provisions as by rules promulgated by management. In sum, college professors just do not have the same degree of autonomy as university professors. No doubt that is tied to the higher levels of research productivity evident at the university level.[1]

Enrollment economics

The pressures of enrollment economics are starkly visible to the faculty of marginal colleges (Riesman 1980). The amount of public funds flowing to state colleges is determined by formulae which are subject to revision as a result of political pressures. In general, the more students, the more funds. Private colleges with minimal endowments are even more directly dependent on enrollment trends in that tuition payments provide most of the institutional operating funds.

---

[1] College professors will argue that given the same resources in terms of released time for research, staff support and stimulation from colleagues and bright graduate students, they could be just as productive. They may well be correct in that assertion.

Enrollment economics also plays a part in the distribution of faculty lines and support services within colleges. Sharply declining enrollments may result in the loss of lines -- through attrition or elimination of certain curricular offerings.

If the size of college-going cohorts declines as is predicted, the competition within and between colleges for student enrollments is likely to become intense. Difficult decisions will have to be made about student recruitment, retention, program specialization and general academic standards. Faculty opportunities for promotion and tenure may also be adversely effected by enrollment declines. Faculty may have to "Please or Perish." The crudest of all possible measures of faculty effectiveness -- drawing power -- may be heavily relied upon. All this, of course, is in direct conflict with the "academic ethos" according to which professors should not have to pay their own way or to be seriously concerned with the dynamics of enrollment economics (Shils 1978).

Problematic goals

Problematic goals may also pose problems for professionally committed faculty who teach undergraduates. The goals of colleges are typically multiple, ambiguous, conflicting and/or contested (Kerr 1963; Baldridge 1971; Cohen and March 1974; Baldridge 1978). A central area of contention within many colleges is the question of the relative importance of research, teaching and service in decision-making regarding the distribution of organizaitonal rewards. Given the present buyer's market in the academic marketplace, it is possible for colleges to attract professionally committed young faculty from high quality graduate schools. These young professors often press for greater emphasis on research, but meet resistance from older faculty who were hired and promoted on the bases of teaching, loyalty, and service to the college. Extension of the "Publish and Flourish" (Trow and Fulton 1975: 75; Tuckman and Leahy 1975; Tuckman and Tuckman 1976; Tuckman and Hageman 1976) rule to teaching oriented colleges can be expected to produce controversy and conflict. When organizational goals are problematic it is difficult for faculty members to decide what their priorities should be. As Crecine (1974: 23) has noted, "the behavioral consequences of goal ambiguity and vagueness in educational systems is an especially important research question."

Collegial Problems

Rate-busters, slackers, charlatans and moonlighters

Since academic departments consist of relatively small numbers of people who share certain basic interests, interact frequently and face certain common and recurrent problems, it seems highly likely that shared professional norms will be evident. New members are selected in terms of their compatibility and prospects for meeting professional ideals. On-the-job socialization helps channelize behavior further. Informal work norms define the level and direction of effort which is considered appropriate by the collegial group and provide benchmarks against which deviance can be measured. Those who conform to these norms enjoy the ". . . intimacy and protection of colleagueship (Hughes 1971: 420)" while deviants are shunned. Some professors may work too hard at their teaching and research, thereby making their colleagues look bad and feel guilty -- these are the rate-busters. Others fail to pull their weight -- the slackers. Still others may prove themselves to be so popular with undergraduates that they are derided as standard lowerers, popularizers and even charlatans. Finally, they may be some who have allowed their side-lines to become more important than their professional duties. Moonlighting then becomes a serious problem.

Of course some departments are more cohesive than others with greater consensus regarding conceptions of professionalism and tighter informal social control of deviants. Some departments may be quite anomic with few social guidelines for academic performance.

Freedom and isolation

One of the great attractions of the professor's role is the high degree of autonomy which is traditionally associated with it. Academic freedom, the right and even the obligation to teach in accordance with one's own individual conceptions of the subject matter is precious to all.

The other side of autonomy, however, is that one may feel uncomfortable about consulting formally or informally with colleagues about professional matters. Most of the sociological literature on higher education suggests that collegial discussion of undergraduate teaching problems is infrequent (Jencks and Riesman 1968; Mann 1968; Meeth 1976). Instructional isolation and loneliness are recurrent themes in studies of schoolteachers (Lortie 1965; Sarason 1971; Warren 1975; House and Lapan 1978: 16-19; Parelius, 1980) as well. The core values of academic freedom and invididual autonomy, coupled in some instances with hyper specialization and intense competition, may limit collegial interaction, support, stimulation, constructive criticism and guidance. The existence of a collegial etiquette similar to that of medical practitioners (Freidson 1975: 241) which discourages unsolicited advice or criticism may further hinder professional consultation regarding pedagogical matters.

Problems with Students

Ideal student -- real student

Professors, like other professionals, have conceptions of what their ideal clients would be like (Becker 1952). They generally prefer students who are bright, interested and intellectual (Davis 1965; Platt, Parsons and Kirshstein 1978). Such students make teaching duties enjoyable because they display qualities which are highly valued within academia. Their conscientiousness and enthusiasm affirms for the professor the importance and value of the life of the mind. In some cases a true mentor relationship may develop and the professor may achieve a degree of vicarious satisfaction through the success of the protege.

But more often than not there is a broad gulf between the professors' ideal student and the average student within their classes. Today many freshmen are very inadequately prepared, often to the point that remedial work is necessary. Remediation is not a task which the ordinary professor will accept willingly. Furthermore, many are bored rather than stimulated by abstract intellectual discussions. Products of a television generation, they assume a passive role and expcet to be entertained in the classroom. Peer pressure may be brought negatively to bear upon the few serious students who do become intellectually engaged. Some student bodies are dominated by fraternity cultures and defensive anti-intellectualism (London 1978). Rather than affirming the worth of the academic profession, the poor student continually raises doubts about the professor's raison d'etre. Those professors who believe in the intrinsic worth of a liberal arts education, may be especially put off by the students' narrow vocationalism. In any case where there is a large discrepancy between the ideal and actual student, a serious problem exists for the professor.

Batch-processing

Another set of problems stems from the fact that professors must teach students in relatively large and heterogeneous batches rather than as individuals in the way that doctors and lawyers deal with their clients (Wheeler 1966). Batch-processing of clients is efficient and economical but from the faculty point of view it clearly has serious costs. A wide range of students is likely to be enrolled in any given class, including some who are bright and motivated, some who are dull and uninterested, and many who fall in between these extremes. Professors are not trained to deal with this diversity. And organizational rewards for the effort involved in trying to individualize assignments are uncertain at best. Batch processing also limits the possibility of professors enjoying the important psychic rewards which come from the knowledge that teaching efforts have clear and strong impact on at least some students (Lortie 1975: 134-161).

Influential amateurs

Despite the fact that students are amateurs and the professor is an expert, students are often highly influential. As Hughes has noted

> It is characteristic of many occupations that the people in them, although convinced that they themselves are the best judges, not merely of their own competence but also of what is best for the people for whom they perform services, are required in some measures to yield judgment of what is wanted to these amateurs who receive the services. This is a problem not only among musicians, but in teaching, medicine, dentistry, the arts and many other fields. It is a chronic source of ego-wound and possible antagonism (Hughes 1971: 346).

Although there is extensive variation among institutions in terms of student power and influence, it exists to some extent in all colleges and universities. Although students may not occupy formal positions of authority, as consumers who are relatively free to choose among courses, they do have an impact (Clark 1956).

This brings us back to the problem of enrollment economics raised earlier. Students are in the position of consumers who have considerable choice from among colleges and from among elective courses within colleges. Increasingly there is competition between colleges and between departments within colleges for undergraduate enrollments. It is truly a buyer's market (Riesman 1980). Undergraduates exert a real and lasting impact upon the careers of individual professors and the fate of whole departments as they vote with their feet in favor of vocational and pre-professional courses of study and turn their back upon majors within the liberal arts. Professors within high demand departments are in a position to become increasingly selective in terms of the students they allow into their courses. Professors in fields suffering from declining enrollments may feel pressured to lower their standards in order to compete successfully for students. That is the real and present danger.

Chapter Three

Historians

The humanities in general, and history in particular, are facing very hard times throughout this decade. On the basis of demographic projections, enrollments in four-year colleges are expected to level off soon and then decline. It is also expected that the tide of student vocationalism will continue to run strong within colleges (Dearman and Plisko 1980). As a result of these trends, the employment market for historians has virtually dried up and career prospects for young people entering the discipline are generally very bleak indeed.

Historians at State College and Private College are cognizant of these national trends. They are acutely aware that their upper-division courses are often under-registered and sometimes cancelled. The pressure of enrollment declines is felt somewhat more intensely at Private College than at State college, but it is a reality of life in both departments.

Virtually all the State College and Private College historians are tenured and therefore relatively secure. Still, they are concerned about the future if present trends continue. Those without tenure are naturally most immediately concerned. But the spectre of retrenchment erodes any complacency which tenure might engender. Everyone knows that the chances of finding a job at another college are poor at best. So they hang on and hope to ride out the storm.

In many respects the two history departments are very closely matched. They are both relatively large departments (Private College, 11; State College, 10) composed entirely of white males. The great majority of the faculty are also married, middle-aged and tenured. The standard assigned teaching loads are equally heavy (12 hours per semester). Further, in both departments virtually all faculty express an interest in both teaching and research, with the older professors generally leaning toward teaching and the younger more toward research. There is a good deal of professional activity in both departments, although publication and presentation of papers on a regular basis is somewhat more common at Private College.

The most striking difference between the two departments is the fact that all Private College historians have completed their doctoral work while only half of the State College history professors have done so. When State College made the transition from a teacher's college to a liberal arts college, it recruited local graduate students, many of whom subsequently never completed their dissertations. Recently hired faculty, in contrast, have their doctorates from respected universities across the nation. At Private College the rule has long been to hire only those who have completed their doctoral studies at prestigious, research-oriented universities outside of the immediate vicinity.

Both departments have been deeply divided at times. Yet today the State College department is a congenial, cohesive group with a strong *esprit de corps* while the Private College department is split and largely demoralized. Our task is to understand why these two departments, which are quite comparable in many respects, nonetheless developed such different patterns of interaction, culture and work.

Conceptions of Professionalism

Most Private College historians have internalized extremely high professional standards. They believe in a comprehensive definition of academic professionalism. That is to say they believe that they should:

1. Make original contributions to their field by doing significant, scholarly research;
2. Communicate the results of their investigations to other historians through publication and the presentation of papers at professional meetings;
3. Keep up with the literature in their specialized areas, and
4. Communicate their knowledge effectively to their undergraduate students.

Of course not everyone does do important and original work. The point is that virtually everyone feels that they should be making significant contributions to their discipline. And not everyone is effective in the classroom. But again, everyone seems to want to be a good teacher.

State College historians in general have a somewhat more focussed definition of professionalism. For them teaching is clearly the central professional task. They believe that one can, and should, show respect for the discipline by being an excellent and demending teacher. Publication is considered desireable, but one can earn collegial respect without being productive in that way. Scholarly reading and reflection in preparation for teaching is highly valued. Although the junior faculty are somewhat more committed to research than the senior department members, relationships between the generations are characterized by mutual respect based upon shared serious commitments to teaching.

Definitions of the Situation

Private College

The fact that Private College historians define academic professionalism in a comprehensive fashion causes serious problems. These professors want to do research and publish, but few are able to maintain a level of scholarly productivity which is satisfying to them. Most feel that the teaching load is simply too heavy. It requires them to devote so much time and energy to teaching that research becomes a spare time activity or is neglected entirely. A few do seem to feel that teaching is a semi-professional activity and are unhappy about being employed at a teaching institution. They are sensitive to the snobbery of their counterparts in research universities. Such professors are struggling to maintain their self-respect within a college which significant others (and sometimes they, themselves) consider inferior. As a result they express resentment about being "stuck" and the impossibility of publishing their way out of Private College. One young professor who had published a great deal by Private College standards spoke with a friend who is at the University of California at Berkeley about a job opening at that prestigious institution. He was informed that they would not even consider anyone at the associate professor level who had not published at least two books. He simply could not meet that productivity standard under the circumstances. Thus, he resigned himself to staying at Private College. This professor maintained that he was "happy" at Private College. But his remarks made it clear that he would be happier elsewhere.

Enrollment economics causes problems which are recognized by all Private College historians. In brief they feel that the quantity, and most would also say the quality, of history students has declined dramatically.

As student vocationalism has swept the campus, historians have experienced sharp reductions in the numbers of students in their upper-division classes. Their most immediate concern is whether or not their specialized courses will attract sufficient enrollments to be given. As one professor put it, ". . . our preregistration figures are known as the Nielson ratings. They tell you whether you're going to be cancelled or whether you can have another run at it."

A somewhat more distant concern is with the retention of faculty lines within the department. It is considered unlikely that the department will be allowed to retain the lines held by retiring senior professors. If those lines are shifted to departments experiencing increased student demand, gaps will develop in the history curriculum. No matter whether these specialized courses are dropped or filled by someone who is not intimately familiar with that material, in either case the History department's viability as a strong and independent entity with a core of its own majors is threatened.

Some historians fear that in time the whole liberal arts division may be weakened to the point that it operates only in a service relationship to the stronger vocational divisions. They feel that if the liberal arts are weakened sufficiently, the viability of the whole college may be threatened. The fear that the college could ". . .go down like the Titanic" was expressed by several professors.

Many Private College historians are quite confused about organizational priorities and goals. They believe that they are sent mixed signals from the administration.

On the one hand they are exhorted by their respected Dean to strive for excellence and rigor in teaching and to resist the temptation to relax grading standards. The Dean feels that grade inflation is a serious problem which threatens to undermine the integrity of the liberal arts programs. A rise in the overall grade point average might be justified if there was evidence of an upgrading in the quality of liberal arts students. But in actuality there has probably been a significant deterioration in the ability, preparation and motivation of the average student. Thus, liberal arts faculty are urged to hold the line and flunk the weakest students out if necessary.

On the other hand the historians note that higher level administrators seem preoccupied with fiscal matters and faculty productivity as measured by class enrollments. Although they do not have concrete evidence, they feel that the central administration has relaxed entrance requirements. As one professor put it, "I guess we are not at the bottom of the barrel yet, but we must be getting close to it." Further, the professors note that the rules regarding academic probation have been relaxed in order to retain as many students as possible. They also suspect that the administration has made only halfhearted attempts to recruit liberal arts students and has been biased in favor of the business school. The historians' animosity toward the central administrators makes them deeply suspicious of any affirmations of enduring organizational commitment to an excellent liberal arts program. Although class cancellations due to minimal enrollments have been rare to date, the fear and expectation is that they will become more frequent in the future and that the liberal arts departments will gradually become clearly subordinate to and dependent upon the business school.

Thus, the historians note that administrators profess a commitment to the goal of maintaining excellence in the humanities, but appear to take actions which are inconsistent with that commitment. And despite rhetoric about maintaining standards in the face of declining enrollment, most Private College historians feel that maximizing the number of warm bodies in the classroom is the administrative bottom line.

The major disjuncture between faculty definitions of ideal students and their perceptions about the actual students complicates the picture. Virtually all the historians are seriously concerned about the deterioration they see in the quality as well as the quantity of students in their courses. They feel that they are getting more and more students who are much more interested in fraternities, sports, parties and drinking than in history. Due to inadequate earlier training the students enter history classes without a good factual background and often with negative attitudes. Sometimes when such students sit together in class they can be quite distracting and disruptive. There are some excellent students, but they are few, far between and often majoring in business subjects. Most faculty share a negative definition of the average student as being poorly prepared, unmotivated and seeking enjoyment, not intellectual challenge. They know that some students consciously choose courses on the basis of their convenient scheduling and easy grading. From this it follows that they will avoid challenging classes wherever possible. And, further, that demanding lots of work from students and being stingy with high grades can only result in an exacerbation of declining enrollments.

Although administrators may consider the goals of striving for excellence and increasing enrollments to be consistent, the history faculty, by and large, does not agree. They feel that it might work that way if the students appreciated exacting and demanding courses, but they do not believe that most students appreciate those qualities. So most historians feel that if they taught in accordance with the highest standards of their profession they would lose students and, perhaps ultimately their jobs.

Eight of the eleven historians agreed with the statement, "Some very popular teachers are charlatans." It was acknowledged that such individuals existed not only within the college as a whole, but even within the department proper. The individuals are considered to be nice, hard-working, but basically incompetent. The charlatan's ability to fill classes is valuable to the department as a whole given the pressures of declining enrollments.

It is important to note that several important potential problems were not considered serious by Private College historians. They did not feel under heavy pressure to publish. In fact, they pointed out that there was very little financial incentive to publish in order to move up through the ranks after receiving tenure. They also felt that they had complete academic freedom. Except for the aforementioned pressures associated with enrollment economics they did not complain about "managed professionalism." They felt that the countervailing power of the union protected them from administrative interference. And they felt that union negotiated provisions regarding procedures to be used in case of retrenchment protected their interests as well as possible. So an edge was taken off their anxiety about enrollment declines. Finally, although formal student evaluations were mandated by contract, the instrument agreed upon was nonthreatening and safeguards existed against their abuse in tenure and promotions decisions. In fact everyone agreed that the contractually required student evaluations were basically useless and purely ritualistic. Of course, this did not prevent students from being influential amateurs in that they were able to vote with their feet for some courses and professors.

The fact that these potentially serious problems had been satisfactorily resolved through collective bargaining is highly significant. Despite their generational, professional and political disagreements, Private College historians were united in praise of their union. In fact, the department was a center of union activism. In recent years much of the union's activist core has been centered in the department. And the union seems a more significant organizational unit to many historians than the department itself.

State College

State College historians are in general much less troubled. At present the State College history department is enjoying a period of relative stability. A long-term decline in student enrollments and consequently faculty size has been halted, at least temporarily. And the political and ideological conflict which divided the department during the early 1970's has subsided. The State College historians have set aside their differences and created an arena of warmth and social support within a threatening environment. These historians, in sharp contrast to their counterparts at Private College, are proud defenders of the old academic faith. They share a belief that the study of history can and should be challenging and liberating for undergraduates. They struggle to maintain rigorous academic standards for the students and professional standards for themselves. They are determined to act in a united fashion in order to survive, and perhaps even prosper, in these difficult times.

Here again the most serious problems center around circumscribed career prospects and enrollment economics. The junior members of the department consider themselves lucky to have gained employment within such a congenial department. Some would prefer to have a lighter teaching load in order to do more research, but they all do take their teaching seriously. Everyone is aware that it is tough to get tenure because the state legislature only allocates a few such opportunities to each of the colleges within the state system. And there is a recognition that increasingly one has to justify one's existence through teaching significant numbers of students. Furthermore, there is a realization that even tenure may not be sufficient to protect those near the bottom of the seniority ladder if reductions in force are mandated in the future. At least one junior professor has prepared to teach remedial English if necessary in order to maintain his position.

In general relationships with administrators are good, although there is some tension over the matter of cancellation of classes. The department chairman has been quite successful in negotiating with the administration to retain classes with low enrollments. The chief argument is that faculty carries a very heavy load of students in required introductory courses, so they ought to be allowed to carry many small, specialized upper-division courses. It is felt that the department's reputation for toughness and the chairman's political and bargaining skills have brought a degree of respect from the administration which has been quite beneficial.

Deficient students are perhaps the greatest problem. Like their Private College counterparts, State College professors complain about the average students' poor preparation and motivation, hedonism and "sloth." The faculty take pride in flunking large percentages of the students in their introductory classes. But this complaint does not hold for students in the advanced courses. Such students are presumed to have been attracted by the high standards of teaching and learning exhibited by the department members. At least their performances are considered to be quite satisfactory in most cases.

Situational Adjustments

Private College

The Private College historians have reacted to the restricted career prospects in a variety of ways. At least three have attempted to surmount the limitations of their college through extraordinary and dedicated effort directed toward research and publication. One such professor purposely kept the pressure on himself.

> You do the best you can. Like you see sitting on this desk three books that I have to review and there is another one home. I force myself to read and review books, otherwise I would never do it. I wouldn't be able to keep up as much as I do except I keep agreeing to review things and that forces me to do it. . . I tell myself whenever I finish an article, I'll start another one. It may take a while to get it done, but I've always had something to do--I've always had this sort of pressure on me to do it. . . I know if I didn't go to meetings, if I didn't contact the people who are really active in the field that it would be very easy to just sit back and say after a couple of years, oh well, I'll go home and pursue my hobbies instead of writing of articles. I've got tenure. I'll just keep my courses.

> And who gives a damn? So that's what I feel. I just try to plug away. I keep up in my own particular narrow field, but I simply can't read much else.

Others have scaled down their self-expectations regarding scholarly productivity. For example, one junior member stated

> I had visions of having a great deal of time when I wasn't in class to be doing research. I found that not to be true. So that was a problem. It wasn't a problem in that I think I got adjusted to the idea that classroom teaching is important and that teaching undergraduates is something that if you do it well it can be rewarding. I like the teaching part. I don't think I'll ever be one of the biggies in the field. I don't have that kind of drive to put out stuff. I'm not even sure that I have that ability to do it. But it doesn't bother me.

That such adjustments are not made without pain is suggested by the plaintive remarks of a senior professor nearing the end of his career:

> . . . I'm not the scholar I should be. . .my professional life is not what it should be. It's one of the regrets of my life at this age.

Another form of adaptation is to point out just how demanding good teaching is: "I believe that just keeping up with the literature is a full-time job." Still others cope with restricted career rewards by devoting significant amounts of time and energy to sidelines or hobbies unrelated to the field of history. Many of these adjustments are idiosyncratic. One must make one's own individual peace with the professional and organizational constraints.

But there is one major response which is collective in character -- union activism. At least four members of the department are or have been leaders in the union. One such individual drew a direct connection between career restriction and union involvement.

> . . . there is the very real, practical thing of what happens when you become so dissatisfied with the situation here and you can't move. . . if you can't move, then you've got to make it or break it at this situation. Goddamn it you better organize and do something about it or else you are just simply

> going to live a life of pure disaster in terms of your whole career. I think that has helped to promote unionization among faculty members. The lack of mobility. Because previously if a person became dissatisfied, you didn't try to improve your situation here. You simply went to another place which looked more inviting. But if that avenue of mobility is closed, then you are going to try and improve your position here. And one of the serious ways of doing that is to organize.

Enrollment economics and the twin problems of declining quality and quantity of students have brought collective adjustments. Some of these are formal, but many are informal.

One of the formal adaptations has been curricular revision. Prerequisites for some electives have been dropped. Courses have been revised and given catchy titles. Some new courses have been introduced specifically to bolster enrollments. Although at least two historians characterized these as intellectually weak or "schlock" courses, they were accepted as appropriate compromises to the pressures generated by the enrollment economy.

Another formal, collective strategy has been to develop a team taught introductory course which utilizes extensive, constructive, collegial criticism in an effort to hone and polish the mass lectures. This chore is disliked, but effort is devoted to it in an attempt to recruit majors.

Informal adaptations to declining enrollments are also evident. There have been intermittent, but largely unorganized efforts to recruit students in other ways. In the recent past junior members have joined together to make rather desperate attempts to recruit students for the department by handing out leaflets describing course offerings to students standing in registration lines. Others attempted to raise the quality and quantity of history students by identifying promising individuals in lower division classes and courting them, either by inviting them to lunch or to undertake more challenging individualized assignments. In summary, it appears that Private College historians conformed to the norm, "Attempt to recruit students however you can." But by and large recruitment efforts appear to have been undertaken by isolated individuals or small cliques. They have not been formalized and coordinated departmental efforts.

Many historians admitted that there had been a general relaxation of course requirements and grading standards as a consequence of enrollment pressures. The amount of required reading and writing had decreased and the amount of "spoon-feeding" increased -- changes which were sometimes justified as necessary given the deteriorating quality of the liberal arts students. Eight of the eleven history professors acknowledged grade inflation either on their own part or throughout the campus. Those who judged themselves as grade inflators believed that students receive letter grades one half to a full level higher than ten years ago. Some have agreed among themselves that some compromise with professional ideals regarding grading is necessary, but have agreed upon a limit to the practice. They hold the line on top grades, maintaining the integrity of their A's. Grade inflation was usually attributed to competition between divisions and departments for students. The faculty in the business school were envied because with a surplus of students, "They could afford to be bastards [regarding assignments and grades]." Several historians were vexed about what they considered to be unfair competition for students on the part of other departments within the liberal arts division.

> Ease up, I think, is the best way to say we've dealt with the enrollment problems. And it's a disease, because one department eases up and the other department says -- "Oh-oh, they are getting enrollment. Now we'll ease up a little bit. . .

Deviance from the official and often enunciated norm, "Maintain high expectations and standards for students," is consensually validated as a necessary accomodation to the realities generated by the enrollment economy.

Finally, there is broad consensus on the norm that "One should be accessible to students and attempt to develop personalistic relationships with them." Those department members who are deeply involved in hobbies or sidelines are criticized as are those who attempt to minimize their time on campus in order to do research and publish. Historians feel obligated to go out of their way to encourage and sponsor outstanding students who might do well. This reflects not only a professional commitment which has been maintained but also an individual search for psychic rewards which are relatively rare in undergraduate teaching. Furthermore, the "personal approach" is related to the enrollment economy.

> I think in a school like this . . . a psychological impact is important, so that they will remember Private College as a place where they had four good years and where they met good, decent people -- and you get a kind of loyalty. It's very much in our interest that our students feel that they've had a good experience . . . Public relations is important.

Thus far we have been describing the impact of declining enrollments upon client relationships. Now we turn to a discussion of the ways in which the problem has had an impact upon collegial relationships.

Deep divisions existed within the Private College history department. The most important cleavages were between oldtimers and Young Turks, conservatives and liberals and between the few who were professionally active in terms of research and publication and the rest. Although professionals in other fields often decline to criticize their colleagues to outsiders, we heard embittered descriptions of individuals, cliques and factions. Yet no instance of open conflict or disagreement was mentioned in any of the interviews. The historians always voted as a block on important college issues and personnel matters. Furthermore, a strong informal norm specified that relationships among departmental colleagues should always be at least civil, if not warm. This norm is reflected in the following comment, "There's one guy, I can't stand his guts. But I'm nice to him." There was an unspoken agreement that conflict over the fundamental issues which divided the faculty should be avoided. But the cohesion was only superficial and warm, supportive relationships were confined within narrow friendship groups. Little or no loyalty to the department as a whole was expressed.

There was no consensus within the History department as a whole on standards by which to judge professional competence and commitment. On the one hand there were certain senior professors who felt that some of their young colleagues were too committed to advancing their careers and union politics and insufficiently concerned with teaching and serving the college.[1] On the other hand certain junior faculty characterized some of the senior faculty as incompetent, time-servers, deadwood or even charlatans.

Eight of the eleven historians agreed with the statement, "Some very popular teachers are charlatans." It was acknowledged that such individuals existed not only within the college as a whole, but even within the department. The presence of individuals who deviated from a set of shared norms regarding professional behavior so radically that they were characterized as charlatans produced severe strain.

Some historians clearly wished that they could expel the charlatans. But that is not an easy task within a collegiate context. One seldom directly observes a colleague during the performance of professional duties, so typically reputations are based on hearsay. Furthermore, belief in academic freedom engenders a laissez-faire orientation -- live and let live. Tenure protections are so extensive that it is considered futile to try to document incompetence. Also because personality characteristics are considered to be quite stable, the sense of futility is increased. Private College historians feel it would be destructive both to the individuals accused and the department as a whole if charlatans were confronted. Given the absense of employment opportunities at other institutions, the department becomes the professor's permanent working family. Thus, they are understandably reluctant to take any action which might start a long-simmering feud. Finally, some faculty are ambivalent toward charlatans in their midst because such individuals do contribute to the department by attracting large numbers of students. The ability to fill classes is highly valued. As one historian put it, referring to a colleague he had dubbed a charlatan, "In other ways, he's not a weak sister. He gets enrollments in here." Another professor -- a research-oriented, liberal, union man -- was even more explicit. He described another historian as being popular, but academically feeble. But he went on to comment

---

[1] Dissatisfaction with the time-card orientation associated with unionism did not mean an overall rejection of the union however.

> But I don't know that we've ever done
> any thing about it or ever intend to

> do anything about it, because he does draw fairly decent enrollments, and we just can't afford, given the nature of the economic situation, to do anything about it. It's disturbing . . . but we don't make the rules. If you're going to play the numbers game, that's one of the inevitable by-products.

There was evidence of an informally organized effort to minimize the harmful effects of charlatans on advanced, promising students through the advisement process. Such students were advised not to take more courses with weak colleagues or given independant studies to cover the material. Yet the general attitude towards charlatans varied between resignation and ambivalent acceptance. Thus, the influence of an enrollment calculus matched a departmental style of conflict avoidance and personal distance.

It became clear in our interviews that the faculty union was an especially strong force at Private College. Three of the younger history faculty have been very active in the union. But loyalty to the bargaining agent transcends age, ideological and professional differences. Older department members still bear animosity towards the past college administration whose sins led to the rise of the union. All but one of the senior faculty praised the union as a protective force against an arbitrary administration. As one commented about Private College administrators, "They were the best union organizers you ever saw." The union's powerful protective role in an uncertain environment has won it affection and loyalty. Admittedly most of the members of the department speak in the tongue of academic individualism, which suggests that their guidelines for behavior are self-generated. However, a few members, notably the left-wing radicals, see themselves as "union men" acting in terms of union norms. Thus, one union activist, who sees himself as primarily a researcher, nevertheless has opposed the pressure for more research productivity which has come from the administration.

> From the point of view of a good union member, without compensations from the administration, more research would constitute a "step-up."

Significantly an influential inter-departmental group has developed which forms the informal leadership core of the union. This friendship group, made up primarily of social scientists, is very important to some historians. As described by one member the group is made up of people who have a "liberal to left" political ideology. Yet it is not strictly a political group.

> . . . but some perhaps are not that inclined politically at all, but who kind of enjoy one another's company. We get together socially, we get together professionally. We tend to support one another in terms of very mundane activities -- somebody is moving, somebody needs some chores done, that sort of thing. That's why, among my immediate colleagues or the larger [faculty] I don't have much contact with them.

The members of this group meet frequently, often at the college pub, where they commiserate and discuss campus politics. The professor quoted above portrayed this as a primary group which serves as a buffer against "a bad and deteriorating situation in terms of the profession."

State College

State College historians have set aside past ideological, political and professional differences and united in an attempt to survive, and perhaps even prosper, in these difficult times. The process of building and maintaining a working consensus within the department began in 1973 and continues today. At present these historians have reached informal agreement that collegial interaction should be: warm and friendly, tolerant and respectful, frank and open, and supportive of excellence in undergraduate teaching. A few illustrations will clarify the importance of these informal work norms in promoting harmony within the department.

The atmosphere of the State College History department was described by one of its members as closely resembling that of a ". . . men's club." An outsider cannot help but notice the extraordinary amounts of discussion, joking and horseplay which take place in the halls. Even the students and secretaries get caught up in the pattern of warm collegiality which prevails. Present as well as prospective historians are judged in terms of their contributions to this pattern of interaction: "Do you laugh? Do you have fun?" An effort is made to include everyone in the fold. But one member has chosen to remain aloof, thereby causing some pain and resentment. That individual has become a social isolate.

"Thou shalt respect one's colleagues and be tolerant of diversity within the department," is another unwritten rule. Although a broad spectrum of political/ideological viewpoints are represented within the State College history department, a more or less conscious decision has been made to set these differences aside in order to maintain solidarity in the face of external threats. It is suspected that the departmental social isolate does not conform to this norm and considers himself to be superior to his colleagues by virtue of the fact that his writings have received national recognition. From a somewhat different perspective it is possible that he is resented as a rate-buster, an individual whose high levels of scholarly productivity exemplify the ideals of academic research culture which prevails in leading universities.

The department's good humor does not preclude conflict. In fact, there has been considerably more open conflict amongst this group than amongst the historians at Private College. The difference between the departments seems to be that at Private College the norm is to avoid or deny conflict while at Public College the ideal is to bring those conflicts into the open and to discuss them with frankness and openness. The department's distinctive, confrontative style is a source of collective pride. As one member noted, it is not a department for a ". . . milquetoast or a person who is lukewarm." According to most accounts, disagreements and resentments do not accumulate. Instead, they are aired, either at a department meeting or through a personal discussion. There may be temporary turbulence, but a healing process begins quickly. One example must serve to illustrate the process. The department prides itself on its rigorous grading standards. In order to help maintain these standards the chairman has made a practice of posting each professor's grade distributions outside the department's office for all to see. He has also sometimes added comments such as "Santa Claus" to call attention to deviance from the unwritten standards. The last time this was done, the department's easy grader actively objected. On the one hand he was moved to write "He who lives in glass houses . . ." next to the chairman's relatively generous grades in one class. But he also brought the matter before a department meeting. His colleagues supported him and directed the chairman to desist in adding the extra comments. The chairman accepted the decision with good humor. In summary, openness, frankness and humor were used to avoid rancorous conflict.

Finally, State College professors display strong commitment to undergraduate teaching. Within the department those who combine general scholarship with strong, tough, dedicated and successful teaching are held in highest esteem. These historians explicitly reject the idea (prevalent in the university-based academic research culture) that one must have a Ph.D. degree and be an active publisher in order to earn recognition as a true professional. Even the younger members of the department, who tend to be more research-oriented and who have completed their doctorates at prestigious universities, recognize that State College is a teaching institution and take their instructional duties quite seriously.

These junior members appear to be genuinely grateful that they have secured employment within academia and are quite pleased with their situation at State College. A wide variety of teaching techniques and styles are considered acceptable. It is only important that the professor actively strive to challenge and stimulate the students.

Declining enrollments pose a serious potential threat to State College historians conception of the ideal relationship between professor and student. The predominant orientation is that the professor should be a taskmaster and judge. True, a professor should be accessible, helpful, and perhaps even friendly toward students, but in all cases the professor's dominance in the relationship should be maintained. Both professors and students should know their place -- a degree of social distance should be maintained. Obviously such an orientation would be difficult, if not impossible to maintain, should the operation of the enrollment economy make the student-consumer sovereign.

The department has attempted to respond to the threat of declining enrollments by increasing both informal and formal recruitment efforts. "I find myself always hustling students," one professor commented. Faculty try to woo good students into the history department mainly through a direct, personal approach which stresses the versatility and utility of a liberal arts degree. "We don't suck up to them," another professor insisted,

> "No, what we do is we will simply sit down and talk with them, that's all. I'll spend time with them talking, pointing out what I think are the advantages of an education in the liberal arts in general, and in history in particular."

A formal division of labor also contributes to the recruitment of students. A younger, non-tenured professor volunteered to start up a recruitment program for younger students. He makes personal contact with students who have been identified by a local educational service as good prospective students. And he conducts a freshman seminar for such students. Although initially this professor worked at recruitment out of a personal concern for career survival, he has continued performing this task as a service to the department after receiving tenure. Also, the tasks of follow-up evaluation and maintenance of alumni relationships have been performed by a senior faculty member. The evaluations, which have been overwhemingly positive, not only serve to indicate continuing concern for students but also help maintain job satisfaction within the department.

Nowhere is the desire to maintain standards more apparent than in regard to grading. When asked about the temptation to relax standards to entice students, the chairman responded:

> You know, to tell you the truth, we've never even thought of it. . . There are certain things on which we all agree . . . We are committed to our discipline. We have a deep respect for it, and it just never occurred to us. . . I mean, hell . . . it's just unthinkable.

Thus, while there is evidence of sensitivity to students in this department, there is no question that the students must conform to the standards of the department, and not vice versa. In fact, the tough grading standards are related to a belief that the students, though poorly prepared, are a pretty capable bunch who need to be challenged, not coddled or spoonfed. Another professor saw no excuse for students who failed history courses. If they fail, he asserted, it is because of ". . . their own sloth and incompetence."

Most of the history faculty have increased their availability to students in response to enrollment pressures. Likewise, they have intensified their formal and informal efforts at remediation. These responses are not solely due to the operation of the enrollment economy, however. In fact, they seem due as much to declining student quality as to a fear of declining enrollment.

According to one professor, there is "constant" discussion of ways to deal with declining student quality. Their formal response has been to seek greater cooperation between history faculty and remedial specialists. For example, before choosing a text for the Western Civilization course, the history faculty consult with Public College reading specialists. Their informal response to declining student quality has been to encourage students to consult them during expanded office hours. This has involved more of a personal approach than in the past, although the fear of a low grade remains a significant incentive for students to seek help.

Most State College historians have little faith in the ability of the faculty union to deal with their most pressing problems -- the quality and quantity of students. They feel that the union is rightfully, albeit not very effectively, concentrating its efforts on trying to protect and improve faculty working conditions and wages. The History department's reaction has been to get and keep their own house in order and to exert pressure on other departments to do the same. The historians have been extremely active in campus governance. Within the context of the faculty senate and committees they have publically confronted easy grading departments and challenged them to follow the History department's example. In bargaining with the administration regarding the retention of classes and faculty lines, the department chairman has argued that he and his colleagues ought to be protected and rewarded not only because they bear the burden of teaching the required history courses to all students, but perhaps more importantly because they are fighting the good fight to uphold high academic standards. When asked what he would do if the Dean asked his department to "ease-up," the chairman asserted that he would ask for it in writing and then proceed to publicize the action.

The chairman's role in creating and maintaining high faculty morale is especially noteworthy. One colleague described him as ". . . a tower of strength, . . . one of the big reasons that this is such a strong, positive department." The chairman's style is open, direct, and confrontative. He is also an individual who can tolerate, and may even welcome, disagreement. It may be significant that severely disruptive feuding and turmoil in the department began to subside when his first term in the chairmanship began. He began the healing process by making public wager with a leading departmental antagonist over a current issue. When he won the bet, he publically and humorously rubbed it in and thereby broke the ice. His example of open, direct and at times self-critical leadership seems to have wide influence among his colleagues.

The chairman cited the public wager as a significant turning point in the direction of greater cohesion. Converting bitter disagreement into sporting conflict allowed the department to come together and face the "crises" of declining enrollment and budget cutbacks together. In these "worst of times" for college history professors, this department has responded with imagination, along with a kind of crusty fidelity to traditional academic norms. In part this seems due to effective formal leadership within a highly democratic, assertive group of individuals.

Summary and Conclusions

We have seen that the members of the Private College and State College history departments have reacted to declining enrollments in dramatically contrasting ways. The Private College historians have significantly compromised their professional standards in an effort to attract and retain students. At State College the battle to maintain those standards continues. But we should remember that as a publically supported institution, State College is somewhat sheltered from the naked reality of maintaining enrollments in order to insure departmental or institutional viability. If enrollment pressures grow significantly in the future, State College historians may also be forced to compromise.

What factors account for the differences between departmental responses? These case studies provide provocative suggestions, but no definitive conclusions. It may be, of course, that wherever there is heavy enrollment pressure, professional standards will be compromised. But our data suggest that successful defence of academic standards requires consensus on professional values and certain specific work norms. It is apparantly not enough to maintain superficially civil relationships with colleagues. Professors must be able to communicate, confront controversy, tolerate a wide (but not total) range of diverse practices, and support one another. Departmental colleagues, the chairman, faculty leaders, union officers and administrative officials all have the power to support or undermine academic standards. Authoritative decisions regarding appointments and promotions, distribution of lines and cancellation of courses are carefully monitored by liberal arts faculty. If those decisions send mixed signals regarding support for liberal arts departments or the importance of publication versus undergraduate teaching, confusion and even fear may result. Consequently, standards are likely to be compromised.

Chapter Four

Political Scientists

Like other liberal arts fields, political science is under pressure from declining enrollments. But unlike those in some other fields, it is possible for political scientists to appeal to student vocational interests. Undergraduates have traditionally seen political science as paving the way to careers in law, governmental agencies of political office.

In terms of size, social composition and professional activity these two political science departments are virtually identical. But the Private College department has explicitly rejected an applied emphasis in terms of a public administration curriculum, while the State College dpeartment has gone the other way. The public administration emphasis is clearly popular and has generated a strong and steady demand for the State College political science offerings. Thus, enrollment pressures are felt more strongly at Private College than at State College. And related problems, including perceived charlatanry and ambiguous goals, are also felt more strongly at Private College.

Private College

The political science department at Private College is small yet cosmopolitan. Of its seven members, six have the doctorate, and the seventh is at the dissertation stage in a fairly prestigious graduate program. For better or worse, this department is very aware of its position vis-a-vis the larger university world which defines professional standards in terms of research. This awareness is reflected in at least two important ways: An acceptance of research culture norms within a predominantly teaching institution, and an institutional inferiority complex articulated by most of the political science faculty.

Most political science faculty are highly attuned to research culture norms, - although few feel they live up to them. Their values, their friendship networks, and their significant professional memories are related to the university world. A number of faculty made references to contacts and relationships with people deeply involved in the research culture. As one professor stated, "When I see people from larger universities who are friends of mine, they talk more about research than they do about their teaching." All agreed that teaching was denigrated within the political science discipline in contrast to research where "you earn your stripes." One professor, who was avowedly committed to teaching, frequently referred to early experiences at a prestigious research-oriented university.

Their acceptance of research culture norms probably made these faculty less satisfied with their job situations at Private College. Although all of them indicated deep commitment to teaching and its consequent satisfactions, expressions of job fulfillment or satisfaction were totally lacking. There were many references to job frustrations, particularly to the lack of time for research. It seems evident that research culture norms clash with institutional norms, which demand not only a heavy teaching commitment, but also considerable administrative work and campus presence.

Departmental Cohesion and Working Groups

"To some extent we get along quite well," one political science professor commented, adding that his was an "up" department. "We have been able to control conflicts, - keep conflicts at a civil level." This seems to be an accurate description of collegial relations in this department. A working unity exists, epitomized by a moderate civility which itself veils personal differences. This is not a department which denies conflicts. Often conflict is avoided, controlled, or kept civil - but it has been recognized. Arguments do occur, although infrequently, at department meetings. Personal confrontations are unusual, but they too have occurred. Personal differences, competition, and even shifting personal alliances seem to underlie a formal consensus. However, there seems to be a balance between personal interaction and personal distance which helps maintain a qualified civility. One faculty member offered a somewhat harsher, though consistent, description: "There is a lot of thinly veiled jealousy and hatred in the department . . . . For the name of cohesiveness we get along."

Most people we interviewed asserted that morale in the department was good, in contrast to low morale throughout the college. Although they might be critical of Private College, and "run down" the mediocre student body, most political scientists were content with their departments. One individual offered the theory that this contentment was based on a system built around academic individualism and "mutual satisfaction"

> We all agree that there should be no orthodoxy in contents . . . . And each person is free to . . . carve out a niche of a number of courses, four or five courses, that he or she will own in a sense, and foster and develop the way he or she wants to.

There is nothing uncommon about the division of academic curriculum into almost feudal domains ruled by chieftains who jealously guard their intellectual "turf." So why is it so important to the morale of this department? Others we interviewed associated this "pluralism" with a benevolent academic freedom which characterizes the department. This department, we were told, is particularly respectful of diversity in teaching and research. To one individual, it has offered relief from the graduate school environment where there were different intellectual "camps" to which people subscribed with inflexible rigidity. This academic freedom contributes to mutual tolerance, relief from external pressures, and (indirectly) to job security and satisfaction.

However, there is another side to this issue. One member of the department noted that the "tremendous emphasis" on academic freedom could lead to too much "carte blanche" in the classroom. Since classroom techniques are sometimes discussed at department meetings in a non-threatening way, this serves as a mild controlling mechanism over abuses of academic freedom. In addition, many department members referred to a small-department and small-college atmosphere, in which gossip and reputation also act as informal means of social control.

Another political scientist suggested that academic freedom protected personal and professional insecurity. Although the faculty's contract specifies that classrooms should be "open" to peer observation, he noted that most people would be "outraged" if that were actually practiced. "I don't think many of us really have a systematic pedagogy," he continued, "and don't want to open questions which perhaps ought to be opened up."

Clearly academic freedom serves a number of critical functions in this department. Most obviously, it allows faculty members to retain a particular realm of academic turf. This is especially important because the "turf" corresponds to an area of research interest. Given the heavy teaching load, teaching an area of research interest is absolutely critical in being able to keep up with your field. Thus academic freedom and consequent course "ownership" help a faculty member maintain a sense of professionalism.

Secondly, academic freedom helps provide an island of security within turbulent academic waters. In an institutional environment where retrenchment, and even abolition, are distinct possibilities, academic freedom does provide some relief from external pressures. Moreover, when political scientists look at other Private College departments, they see factionalism and "camp" divisions. Less positively, academic freedom also protects individuals who might be insecure about their lack of research and their "loser" self-image.

Thirdly, academic freedom functions as a conservative force, helping faculty defend against change - from within and without their departments. When the Private College administration circulated a memorandum citing Political Science as one of the higher grading departments, one faculty member expressed outrage at this alleged invasion of academic freedom. Similarly, younger faculty complained that their senior colleagues resisted change on the same grounds. Also, academic freedom, in some cases, serves as a shield against confronting professional and heuristic differences.

Mixed Organizational Messages

The institutional setting, at Private College, creates conflicting pressures whose lack of resolution contributes to a feeling of malaise. Private College exists geographically in a research culture environment, - a "little college nestled between giants." New faculty are often recruited from major universities in the general vicinity; older faculty often live in close proximity to these institutions. Moreover, the Private College administration does encourage research, - although, as we shall see, in a qualified way. Although the administration may give mixed signals, most faculty believe that some research is necessary for promotion and tenure. One political science professor, in fact, referred to the administration as a "secularizing, modernizing force."

Still, despite self-generated and 'environmental" pressure to produce research, the countervailing institutional forces opposed to research are more powerful.

Beyond the formidable obstacle of a hefty teaching load, there exists a "Private College" atmosphere which demands significant institutional commitment. In real terms, this means volunteering for special projects, serving on committees, and being generally available to students. Although most faculty can be given teaching schedules which can be fit into three or four days, there is an informal expectation that faculty should be on campus every day. These norms are more applicable to young non-tenured faculty than to tenured veterans. As one younger faculty member noted:

> It becomes perfectly legitimate here to become overwhelmed by one's teaching and administrative duties . . . . It becomes less legitimate if one complains because he spent a long time doing research over the weekend or staying up late night doing research. That's not fair, that's not a fair complaint, that's selfish.

Another colleague was even more explicit in describing the clash between informal institutional norms and research culture norms:

> . . . there seems to be this community called Private College which sort of

> takes on a club atmosphere, however not to be confused with a vibrant, intellectual, collegial kind of place . . . . In general terms, it is more important to the old-timers that one internalize the norms of Private College as opposed to personal, individual, research or something.

The source of these institutional norms is not clear. The "Private College" atmosphere seems to be encouraged by senior faculty along with the administration. But, as already noted, the administration wants research and is perceived by some faculty as a "modernizing force". Some faculty note, with apparent accuracy, that the college administration sends out "mixed messages" - encouraging research, but tolerating, and even advocating conditions which make the conduct of research improbable.

The administration's "mixed messages" can be traced to the same contradictory pressures which the faculty experience. The administration's concern with enrollments leads to ambiguity regarding academic standards. Students are rarely flunked out at Private College. Thus, despite the Administrations moves in the direction of tougher grading, some faculty have picked up the message that high standards need not be enforced. The survival of students with abysmal grade point averages is living testimony to an ambiguous policy.

Similarly, we can speculate that pressure to maintain or increase enrollments leads the administration to encourage faculty presence and availability. Budget pressures rule out any lessening of the teaching load. The need to focus college policy around enrollments tends to denegrate those professional commitments which seem to make no direct contribution to enrollments.

On the other hand, the administration is not immune to research norms. To some extent the prestige of administrators depends on the prestige of their campus. Private College administrators have at least a long-range interest in improving the professional quality of the faculty. Like the faculty, they exist in a world of university-oriented values. Moreover, they seem to possess a genuine concern with improving standards and raising academic quality.

The administration has attempted to resolve these contradictory pressures through an obvious compromise regarding research. At Private College, the definition of scholarship is institutional rather than professional. The administration accepts a definition of scholarship which includes research and writing that does not result in publication. In truth, some evidence of research - even note cards - seems acceptable for promotion and tenure. This definition of "scholarly activity" is broad enough to include older and younger faculty, and conforms to an environment which informally works against publication.

This liberal definition of "scholarly activity" does not counter, and may only contribute to a sense of inferiority which was expressed in almost all our interviews. One political scientist noted that he avoids conventions, not wanting to be associated with Private College, because "elite people will perceive me as a failure." Another agreed that snobbery towards Private College "is kind of well-founded" because the institution does not encourage excellence. Still another described this institutional inferiority complex as the basis for a presumption of mediocrity: "We will sometimes wonder how we got 'X' person, whether as a student or as a faculty member, because we are only Private College . . ."

In a setting where even an enthusiastic faculty member described Private College as the "little league", it is no wonder that many political science faculty refer often to a malaise and discontent in the college. Although the political science faculty agreed that departmental morale is not low, they all referred to low institutional morale. One faculty member, who feared that he might be a "lifer" forever "stuck" at Private College, indicated that the faculty suffered from "a sense of dispair" due to research frustrations. Others asserted that institutional morale was low because of declining enrollments. In any case, most political science faculty perceive their larger collegial environment as negative. One individual remembered advice given years before to "stay out of the teacher's room . . . because you really pull each other down, and by the middle of the year you hate yourself, your job, you hate your colleagues, you hate the place."

Problems and Adjustments

The political science faculty generally agree that declining enrollment is a major problem at Private College. "We talk constantly of the declining enrollment," the chairman noted, and his assessment was supported by our other interviewees. However, most faculty referred to declining enrollment as an institutional problem to which the department responds, rather than as a purely departmental issue. An institutional consensus exists around this problem, and as one professor aptly put it, "there is . . . in the air the idea that we live in very dangerous times. . . ."

The political science department perceives enrollment as a real problem which requires adaptation, not drift. Its response to enrollment dangers has been moderate, perhaps reflecting the moderate cohesion in the department.

Two areas have recieved increased attention, curricular revision, and recruitment policy, in an effort to attract more students.

Curricular revision has been a major departmental concern over the last year. Much of the actual work has been done by the younger faculty, who have offered a set of proposals for departmental review. According to a younger faculty member, there was "pressure to tailor the curriculum for the sole purpose of gathering bodies." Despite this pressure, the curricular modifications which were made are not seen as a compromise of professional standards.

There were two significant aspects of this course revision. One involved the introduction of a new course in political economy aimed basically at attracting business majors. The other was the formation of a Freshman Seminar, taught by one of the younger faculty, which is aimed at creating a core of highly committed majors. This seminar would function as a recruitment device, with the goal of creating "a sense of community among our majors."

As articulated by the chairman, this freshman seminar also reflects a departmental approach to recruitment. The psychological function of the seminar is of at least equal importance as its content. According to the chairman, the seminar aims to "decrease the possibility of anomie or alienation . . . ." By providing a sense of belonging and community, the faculty can "help the student find himself or herself and be comfortable with whatever that is being found there." Again, content seems less significant than access to adults who care about students.

As we discovered in other interviews as well, enrollment problems often encourage a greater orientation to students. But increasingly the "product" fashioned to attract students in this enrollment economy includes empathy, understanding, and support, along with knowledge. At Private College, at least, this might be due to a fairly dim view of the students' academic abilities. Offering interesting or significant knowledge may not be enough to attract students, or to gain personal satisfaction as a teacher and authority figure. Thus, a strong student orientation generates an emphasis on access and availability, which some faculty see as the strong points of the small Private College atmosphere. As the political science chairman saw it, ". . . the game now is retaining students and you will do that by being available."

There have also been other, more specific efforts at recruitment in this department. One of the younger faculty, who "relates" well to students has taken the responsibility of contacting new students, in an effort to interest them in the Freshman Seminar, and in political science, in general. A "mock Presidential convention," also administered by a young non-tenured faculty member, is another device aimed at recruitment. These efforts reflect a moderate response to the enrollment problem, at best. Their assignment to younger faculty members probably indicates a lingering resistance to a wholesale recruitment campaign. As one tenured political scientist commented, regarding recruitment, "It's pretty distasteful to members of my department. We've all been avoiding it."

State College

The atmosphere in the political science department at State College seems more comfortable and secure than at Private College. In our interviews we encountered fewer references to low morale, research frustrations, and retrenchment fears caused by declining enrollment. Although this department has made a serious adjustment to enrollment pressures, and some work dissatisfactions were expressed, there was little indication of the conflict and intensity we found at Private College.

From their own viewpoint, State College political scientists were less concerned about research frustrations than about the overall effects of an enrollment economy. Only one of this five-member department is deeply concerned with research. This individual's major complaint is that research is not sufficiently rewarded, not that it cannot be accomplished. Other department members who feel frustrated in their ability to conduct research, are still generally satisfied with their job. Unlike some of their counterparts at Private College, they do not articulate a "loser" self-image or refer to an institutional inferiority complex.

The Department as A Work Group: Self-governing 'Professionals'

State College political scientists frequently refer to themselves as "professionals". To them professionalism involves more than academic and educational expertise. It also involves an assumption of academic freedom and personal distance even more pronounced than we discovered at Private College. To State College political scientists, "professionalism" is a code word for individualism and non-interference.

In sum, collegial relations are highly atomistic in this department, and are characterized best by the description of one member: "there are lots of invitations, but very little follow-up." People live in scattered places and, despite the small size of the department, they find it difficult to coordinate their schedules in order to get together. Moreover, as one member put it, "we prize our free time." Predictably, we find little hostility along with little warmth among this group. Instead, relationships seem low-key, tepid, and somewhat boring.

Department members offered a few basic explanations for this atomism. Professionalism and geographic distance were the most common, but a few of the faculty stressed the existence of a consensus on all significant issues. In their view, consensus seemed to derive naturally from professionalism. To say, "we are professionals in this department," inherently suggests a set of shared norms that can be presumed without conversation or much personal interaction. One member hinted that this "professional consensus" was enforced by informal pressures generated within a very small department. Colleagues, for example, would express their displeasure in "subtle" ways "without saying anything - there's really no need to say anything."

While this atomistic atmosphere helps maximize free time and personal freedom, it also contributes to a pattern of avoidance and anomie which is evident to some members. During one major crisis in the department - the election of a new chairperson who was challenged by a department member - since retired - the besieged individual turned outside the department for personal support. The existence of other reference groups, often professional, and usually off-campus, seems especially important to these faculty for both intellectual and personal support.

There are other obvious consequences of this individualistic pattern. Department members tend to avoid conflict and accept deviance which, at heart, they may find intolerable. References to their retired colleague suggested that he deviated from professional standards and inter-personal norms. Still, he was not confronted, and his behavior was rationalized in terms of 'emotional' and 'psychological' problems. Faculty are very reluctant to criticize and evaluate one another, agreeing upon an interpersonal etiquette of cordiality and self-control. As one member indicated, expressing criticism of colleagues' teaching approaches would be very hubristic.

This professionalism in this department is very close to academic 'self-reliance.' But it also involves unspoken 'adjustments' to the realities of institutional life. A professional, then, is a faculty member who can perceive and respond to the organizational setting. In return, that organization must permit the professional academic freedom, at least in regard to teaching, and the dignity that comes with academic freedom.

Organizational Problems and Adjustments

State College political scientists are emphatic in referring to enrollment pressures as an external problem to which the department has responded. They view enrollments as a constant concern of the college administration - a concern which seemingly has penetrated department policy but not its hearts and minds. One faculty member referred to enrollments as "not a departmental problem, but a college problem." Different political scientists referred to "the market approach of the administration," "too much emphasis on numbers," and "state productivity findings" as sources of external pressure. These political scientists see themselves as academic professionals who should not be concerned with these administrative aspects of college life.

Despite their criticisms of the administration, political scientists at State College have reacted as a department to the pressure to maintain enrollments. Their primary response has been the development of a public administration program within the department. This program satisfies the 'market' concerns of both the administration and the students, in that it is assumed to be 'practical'. That is, the public administration program presumably helps prepare the student for a job in government.

There is full agreement amongst department faculty that the public administration program has been responsible for increasing the number of student majors, as well as helping maintain faculty lines. Within the last four years the number of political science majors has risen from 110 to 175. Out of the 175 majors, it is estimated that 100 are concentrating in public administration. At the same time, the public administration courses have come to service other departments, thus buttressing department enrollments even further. One department member, a former chairperson, summed up the role of public administration in the following terms: "If we did not have the PA emphasis the department would have been smaller . . . . Our PA emphasis really draws a lot of students."

The public administration emphasis has been an acceptable adjustment for this department because, although a bow to the marketplace, it qualifies as a legitimate academic program. Department members do not question the intellectual validity of the program, and seem to appreciate the program's stress on both theory and practice. In fact, it was the department's specialist in public administration who lamented the de-emphasis on some of the political science's traditional areas, like political theory, for the sake of a heavy vocational orientation. His own approach to public administration was decidedly non-vocational: "I would rather have people think, than have people come out of my course, such as a course in budgeting, simply feeling that they have mastered tools. . ." Thus the public administration program is an acceptable adjustment because it conforms to a humanistic and liberal arts orientation in the department.

The public administration program has brought with it some minor problems along with its obvious benefits. It has tended to limit the scope of the curriculum, particularly in traditional areas. (However, most assert, there would just be fewer resources.) In a few cases, faculty have had to teach PA-oriented courses, outside their own speciality. In addition, the PA program has attracted students who naturally have a vocational bent, which tempers some of the joys of teaching.

Aside from the public administration program, the department does not convey any other collective response to enrollment pressures. Specifically, department members are unanimous in assuring that there has been no pressure to relax standards due to an enrollment economy. One professor asserted that there is not "one scintilla of evidence" regarding any pressure to relax standards. Unlike Private College, there was no indication of ambiguous messages on the administration's part. In fact, department members generally praised the administration's efforts to raise admission standards.

If anything, there was slight ambivalence expressed by department faculty regarding grading standards. Apparently the department's earlier reputation for being "tough" has changed in recent years. "We're not the most difficult department . . . as far as grades are concerned," the chairman stated, "but it's far from the easiest . . ." Another faculty member indicated that nobody "consciously" lowers grades, and noted (suggestively) that "no matter how low our grades can get down, we still won't be able to attract students."

These intimations of liberal grading perhaps account for some of the resentment expressed at other departments, notably history, which try to enforce tough grading standards on their colleagues. State College political scientists suggest that required courses give other departments a protected position, from which it is easy to sling accusations of liberal grading at fellow departments. They prefer 'laissez-faire' between departments, lest criticism lead to recriminations and strife.

Beyond the problem of enrollment, there are no other major concerns which dominate the life of this department. The only other issues mentioned with any frequency were the quality of the student body, and the hardships of a heavy teaching load. These two issues are closely related and deserve some brief discussion.

Political scientists have mixed perceptions of the student body at State College. We heard a variety of complaints about the students' excessive vocational emphasis, their lack of motivation and preparation, and their hostility towards intellectual work. One faculty member was clearly upset about the students' resistance to reading assignments he believed to be quite ordinary. Another spoke for many in lamenting the poor writing skills possessed by most students.

Nevertheless, denegration of students was neutralized by an important factor: The administration has raised admission standards over the last few years, and the quality of the students, albeit mediocre, has been improving. Thus most faculty express some pride in State College's improved reputation and credit the administration's efforts to create a better student body.

Similarly, the burdens of a heavy teaching load were recognized as a problem, but one that most faculty 'took in stride.' Heavy teaching responsibilities, combined with mediocre students, diluted job satisfaction and research opportunities. Still, political science faculty accept a four-course load as a seemingly unalterable fact of life. Most are not research-oriented, and the two who are have sought and received released-time. For most, accepting the burdens of teaching are part of one's professional commitment, and adjustment to institutional realities.

A common pattern seems to characterize the processes of adjustment and adaptation in this department. Faculty respond to problems, sometimes through mutual sharing and group decisionmaking, but often through unspoken, nonconsensual sharing. In the name of professionalism, certain codes of personal adaptation have been accepted, and need not be articulated openly. Because of this, it is possible that we were not privy to a deeper, less obvious dynamic which might prevail in this department.

Perhaps the small size of the department accounts for its particular pattern. Recruitment of low-key, adaptable personalities might be another possibility. In any case, in this department a very special, even subtle definition of professionalism plays an extremely significant role.

Chapter Five

Biologists

Compared to the humanists and social scientists, the biologists are relatively well off as a professional group. Theirs is a very dynamic field and one which offers many nonacademic jobs for both students and faculty. Many of the familiar problems centering on the quality and quantity of students and on the difficulty of doing significant research and teaching were apparant, however.

The Private College Biology Department

The Private College Biology Department is a small, seven-member department. We were able to interview five of the members, as the other two conspicuously refused to cooperate. With this small number of interviews it was difficult to obtain a rich picture of collegial relations. Yet in regard to other matters, notably research and enrollments, we encountered no significant limitations.

Private College biologists place considerably more emphasis on research than the other departments we interviewed. This emphasis, in turn, impacts a number of related areas, like client and collegial relations. In addition, research orientations seem related to certain shared attitudes, most obviously a general agreement on the value of merit awards.

Research is defined as important, for a number of reasons. Private College biologists adhere to a comprehensive definition of professionalism. Both research and teaching are highly valued. Like most academics they recognize that research is the path to professional glory. Yet unlike many of their colleagues in other departments, biologists believe that they can do research, and perhaps even well, within the limitations of Private College. To a greater extent than historians, for example, biologists believe they can act as professional researchers.

This relates to a second reason for the emphasis on research. Many Private College biologists perceive their administration as supportive of research and grant-getting. As one professor put it: "You have money for meetings, grant support, you name it, and I think I have as much of it as most people at major universities." Others may have been less enthusiastic, but all the faculty see the administration as supportive of grant-getting and research. Another professor, who has abundant publications and grants in his background, emphasized that research can be done, but it is related to the size and status of the college. That is, Private College biologists cannot do the same type of research, or receive the same kind of grants, as their counterparts at major universities. Yet they can do research - and they expect that others can, too.

A third reason for their research emphasis is that Private College biologists preceive research as an absolute necessity for tenure and promotion. This perception

113

is especially interesting, because it is not shared to any great extent by other departments. Certainly, in history and political science, faculty members perceive research as a requirement, but often a flexible one, which can even be institutionally defined. In biology, however, there is a widely held belief that professional research is vital for institutional advancement. As a senior biology professor noted: "It is not basically a teaching institution anymore . . . your publication record plays a dominant role in promotion and tenure."

The fact that there is such variation between departments within the college regarding the clarity of research productivity norms illustrates the structural looseness of academic organizations. Departments function in a largely autonomous fashion in setting their own particular requirements. Because departmental evaluations and recommendations are crucially important in personnel decisions, the standards developed within the department have greater operational importance than standards of the college as a whole which are often more global and ambiguous.

In sum, research is an important value in this department, although it coexists quite amicably with an appreciation of teaching. Private College biologists see themselves as practitioners and experimentors who do laboratory research as part of their professional definition. They personally value and enjoy research as a major facet of their professional life. "I think the fact of the matter is," one stated quite frankly, "that there are probably more personal rewards in research at this point in time than there are in teaching."

Professional Standards

The commitment to high professional standards which is reflected in a strong research bias resonates in other aspects of department life. In respect to client relationships, Private College biologists maintain high and often hard-nosed teaching standards, and many value the professional distance between instructor and student. In respect to collegial relations, they generally recognize a cleavage between "young" and "old" faculty at Private College as a whole, and they are disdainful of faculty who appear to be lax in their professional responsibilities.

Among those we interviewed, there was universal agreement about the poor preparation of Private College students. Although there are a number of good students, one biologist acknowledged, "many are not really college material." The lack of student preparation seems to be widely discussed and exists as a shared group perception, with a number of ramifications in terms of teaching. Inadequate preparation forces faculty to repeat basic material, restricting them from introducing modern facts and concepts. The existence of a large number of poorly prepared students in a mixed student body of differing backgrounds, makes teaching large freshman classes especially frustrating.

While biology faculty share a common perception of inadequate student preparation, they are even more agreed upon a lack of student motivation. One professor referred critically to the college's "party atmosphere," which supports "the incredible inertia" among day school students. Others referred to a decline in motivation which made students less willing and able to handle sufficient course material. Motivation, most agreed, was the major problem, rather than mal-education or mediocre ability. One biologist emphasized, in fact, that business majors were the prime students, precisely because of their greater vocational interests and basic motivation.

In the face of ill-preparation and academic apathy, the biology faculty remains dedicated to high standards and professional teaching commitments. "I work them hard anyway," a junior department member stated, although the students rarely work up to his expectations. "I'll fail the whole class if I have to," said a more senior member, although he indicated that even with mass failures the students could not handle the required material. A colleague described his poorest students with a typical stubborness, "If a guy is so dumb that he doesn't understand anything and refuses to ask questions, - well, it's his tough luck."

Biology faculty members describe themselves as sensitive to students, yet loyal to high teaching standards which support a necessary distance between professional faculty and unlettered students. Their attitude towards students is generally traditional; that is, despite their obvious concern about students, there is not talk of student "equality" or "input". Students come to college for an education, and "do not necessarily know what's right and what's wrong and what's best and what's not best." Another put it more personally, "I don't get very friendly with my students. I don't think that's an appropriate activity."

Some of the same fidelity to standards is reflected in regard to collegial relationships. For example, there was significant criticism of "unmotivated" faculty, "moonlighters" who are lax in their teaching obligations, and tenured faculty who have eased off in their commitments. One department colleague was chastised in particular for being both an easy grader and so lax that other faculty had to police his exams to prevent cheating. Two faculty members also described "old guard"/"young guard" cleavages, based again on different approaches to teaching and research commitments.

One biologist portrayed the differences between junior and senior faculty within the college as a whole. The bulk of the senior faculty, in his estimation are "inferior" and apathetic. Such professors are thought to be more concerned with union activities than research. The tendency of senior, tenured faculty to hand over work to junior faculty engendered feelings of exploitation. Private College itself encourages a "country club" atmosphere which tolerated intellectual and professional laxity. Those views were frequently expressed but seldom in such caustic terms.

The biologists' commitment to a comprehensive definition of professionalism was also reflected in a preference that did not appear in any department we investigated: a desire for merit incentives. Merit awards are anathema to die-hard unionists, and are not popular on this campus. However, three biologists indicated that the union contract should include merit incentives to induce people to work harder.

Here we must include an important point which becomes even more salient in our discussion of the State College College biology department. Amongst biologists - at both institutions - there is a powerful work norm that says essentially: "Thou shalt be on campus, doing your work - in the classroom, laboratory, or in your office." To most biologists, then, work can be measured by visible time working on campus. They are suspicious of people whose work they cannot see. Faculty who work at home, or in the library, or, even their own colleagues who work in the field, naturally fall under shadows of professional doubt.

Private College biologists believe that they deserve merit rewards, in part, because they obviously work harder and longer than their colleagues in other disciplines.

The Enrollment Picture

> We probably lose over 50% of our freshman class who intend to major in biology. But we would rather do that than drop our standards - where we would pass those students and keep them in biology - because it's cutting our throats in the long run.

Like the other departments in the liberal arts school, biology has suffered from the decline in student enrollment. It has suffered in terms of a sharp decline in majors, half today of what it was four years before. The decline in majors, in turn, has adversely affected enrollment in upper-level electives. Declining enrollment has also led to less discriminate recruitment of new students and a consequent decline in student quality. Although, as the above quote indicates, biology faculty are staunch in their commitment to high standards, some fear that a drop in student quality will ultimately lead to an easing of standards.

Biology enrollments are secured, to some extent, by a college rule that every student must take a science course with a required lab component. However, a few biologists complained that other science departments have introduced relatively easy courses designed to lure enrollments. In the face of this competition, biology faculty refuse to bend. Significantly, they see these rival courses as a threat to academic rigor as much as a threat to departmental enrollments.

Their response to declining enrollments is not clear. Obviously, one course of response has been to maintain standards, perhaps based upon an even greater awareness (pride?) of their own professionalism as they see it decline within the college. Two members discussed their participation in recruitment efforts, which as a rule, do not seem very intensive or well-administered. A senior member of the department, with less apparent job insecurity than his peers, stated: "There are some faculty members who don't want to get involved in the recruiting process. . . . but there are some who feel we should. Our career is at stake. We have to compete with the state institutions. . . ."

The State College Biology Department

For most members of the State College biology department, being a professional means doing both teaching and scholarly research. Teaching is the primary commitment, in part out of choice and in part because the four-course teaching load demands so much in time. However there is general agreement that faculty members should be doing research. Controversy exists over what qualifies as research, and whether or not some department members are genuinely pursuing research goals.

In the words of one of its senior members, in the State College biology department "we all mutually agree that the student is number one on our list of priorities . . ." Even amongst those who are most dedicated to research, this concern for students remains dominant. When asked to describe their goals, these biologists invariably refer to their aims as educators. Although frustrated research aspirations represent a major problem, teaching frustrations - especially the declining quality of the student body - pose an equal or even greater problem. As one biologist put it, "this is a teaching institution," - and the shape of their professional commitment is molded by that fact.

Although the primacy of the of the teaching commitment seems to be essentially a situational adjustment, professional socialization and recruitment patterns have also played a significant role. Many department members, including those who were trained in esteemed graduate research programs, come to State College with teaching experience and teaching inclinations. Four had held teaching assistantships in graduate school, another had taught at a small liberal arts college for two years, and still another had twelve years of teaching experience at a junior college. Two others had taught high school before being hired at State College. The department's senior member was hired at a time when State College was a teacher-training institution, and he never developed any research interests.

Those who were recruited from research-oriented graduate programs were hardly hostile to teaching undergraduates. All expressed strong teaching commitments and, in fact, two faculty indicated that they were attracted to State College because it is teaching-oriented. One of these, a biologist who is involved in research, wanted to get away from the research "rat race" found at major universities. The other, who attended one of the most prestigious graduate schools in the country, liked the environment at State College because it reminded him of his undergraduate days at a small college. In the same vein, three of the biologists we interviewed referred to their own undergraduate experience at a small college to explain their attraction to State College.

While all this suggests that State College biologists are comfortable with teaching, research frustrations still represent a major dilemma. This department generally agrees that a professional should teach and do research, even if the research is a secondary activity. Those who are considered the department's deviants are too teaching-oriented and too devoid of research interests. All agree that teaching is very demanding, but most feel that research activities should be at least maintained - for the sake of professional growth and as a proper complement to teaching.

Informal Work Groups

In the plaintive words of one of its members, the State College biology department has "that kind of feeling of no family." Most biology faculty describe their department as fragmented, individualistic, and cliquish at its best, with members often "going their own way." Underlying this fragmentation are differences regarding approaches to biology, professional commitment, and personal style.

As in the case of their Private College counterparts, State College biologists are basically split between environmentalists and laboratory scientists. This division seems to be so basic as to be accepted almost as a given. Interaction, to the extent it exists, tends to occur much more within each faction than between them. Although these groups do "lock horns" on a number of academic issues, we were assured that cooperation does occur when a "big" issue arises. Some members even indicated that the department is generally harmonious and cooperative regarding issues which have to do with students, like grading, course preparation, or recruitment. The split between environmentalists and laboratory scientists occurs mostly over definitions of research and is most intense during promotion season.

Still, this split was not the only one that surfaced during the course of our interviews. Five faculty referred, sometimes in very strong language, to a "worker vs. shirker" problem in the department. There was no clear indication that this division is related to the more acknowledged split between environmentalists and laboratory scientists. Since the issue was raised by biologists from both camps, it is not likely that they perceive the divisions as parallel. Nor is there any strong evidence that the alleged workers and shirkers have formed distinct groups. (There was some evidence: The leading proponents of the 'worker' ethos, perceived the department as divided into factions supporting or opposing him.)

Clearly, then, significant professional divisions exist in this department, but they do not appear to coalesce into strong and cohesive informal work groups. Professional differences over research and work norms emerge and recede, depending on the situation, and are always diluted by a mood of individualism which affects most members. This individualistic orientation is built into the institutional structure and is powerfully supported by academic freedom.

Faculty invididualism was attributed to the ideology of academic freedom, the consequences of tenure, and the specialized nature of professional research. Heavy teaching loads and diverse research interests combine to create both the feeling and reality of isolation. "I bet you," one biologist commented, "we could go a full week sometimes and not see some of closer colleagues because we are on the move. . . ."

The self-styled "workers" view this individualism as deleterious, but feel unable to challenge it successfully. "People just like to be left alone," one asserted, "and I don't think that's a healthy situation." Another indicated that efforts to exert social control over tenured "shirkers" were not worth the risk of creating "permanent, hostile relationships." Likewise, one department member who went outside the department with the worker/shirker issue, was castigated by another member as a "psychological derelict" who had violated the norm of departmental privacy. Thus the department's internal affairs are pervaded by individualistic values, while attempts to bring an issue into an outside forum may be seen paradoxically as violations of group cohesiveness.

Organizational Frustrations

For the typical State College biologist, being a professional is a demanding task. It requires excellence in teaching at a time when students are coming to college less prepared and less motivated in the natural sciences. In addition, it requires a dedication to scholarly growth in the face of a heavy teaching load, mixed administrative support, and snobbery in the higher ranks of one's profession.

Although these professors refer frequently to their research frustrations, they indicate predictably that their ongoing problems fall more in the realm of teaching. More than half of the biologists we interviewed cited the mediocrity of the student body as a persistent problem. "On paper, the quality is improving," one professor noted, "but I don't see it." Others, while acknowledging the college's efforts to raise standards, still found too many students inadequately prepared for college-level work. One of the younger department members, whose enthusiasm for teaching was obvious, was nevertheless quite earthbound in describing the students. "My feeling is that there are a lot more dumb kids than there used to be."

Like their colleagues in other departments, these biologists perceive lack of motivation as the key failing of the modern student. Most students, in their view, are interested in making money and getting a good job, but lack intellectual motivation. A very large number of their students are what one professor described as "terminal baccalaureates," uninterested in acquiring professional skills and not stimulated towards professional knowledge. They are "passing through" college, working hard enough to pass their courses because they believe that a college degree holds economic and social value. But their intellectual interests are secondary to social concerns, and a large number spend their time 'partying' and frequenting the college pub. Three professors even suggested that cheating was widespread, especially amongst non-majoring students. As a seasoned, somewhat cynical biologist described them:

> But all too often the students don't care. The adage that youth is wasted on young people is all too true. And the college-age person, most of them that we get here, are not really appreciative of who they are, and where they are, and what they are doing.

Student quality is a serious problem and has generated a number of professional adjustments, which will be described below. Yet it is a tolerable problem, and

State College biologists feel that they have administrative support in dealing with the situation. From all accounts, the administration has not exerted any pressure to decrease standards or ease grading. On the contrary, the administration is generally lauded for its long-range efforts to raise admission standards.

Similarly, the biology faculty can respond to the problem of student quality free of any serious enrollment pressures. Enrollment is, at worst, a "concern" but hardly an over-riding one. The department shares the perception that enrollment is currently sufficient and will not be in peril in the near future. Both the college and department have engaged in recruitment efforts and most members expressed confidence that an enrollment shortfall could be rectified through additional recruitment. Only one faculty member expressed some pessimism, noting that if the college's 'gamble' on attracting better students does not succeed, the enrollment picture could be seriously threatened.

Since the teaching load is very time-consuming, the problem of student quality frequently stands, quite literally, before the professor's eyes. Research frustrations, however, are equally serious, although a faculty member may not have to confront them with similar frequency. Predictably, when a State College biologist has the time to taste the joys of research, its frustrations are more difficult to swallow.

Research frustrations are essentually an organizational problem in the view of most faculty. While most biologists appreciate the fact that the college is becoming more research-oriented, they believe that the college has not really adapted itself to research norms. Thus the college has made scholarly research a signigicant requirement for promotion and tenure. But teaching still dominates the reality of working life at State College, and there is little hope for any change in the situation.

The major organizational problem in this respect is, of course, the heavy teaching load, and its related consequences. A four-course teaching semester is in itself demanding, but it also involves the professor with a large number of students at the college, and a great deal of grading and paperwork at home. "The teaching concept is strong here," asserted one research-oriented biologist, "and if you want to do anything else, it takes an extraordinary effort." This problem is exacerbated for the field-oriented biologists who cannot do research at the college. Realistically, their research efforts must be relegated to the weekends, when they are likely to interfere with family responsibilities. Released-time for research is available, in limited quantities, but it is usually not adequate for sustained research efforts.

For those who are able to do research, the organizational environment presents some other problems. Some biologists feel isolated in their research areas, as they pursue specialized interests normally not shared by their colleagues. A number of faculty criticized the college organization, notably the promotions committee, for evaluating the quantity, rather than the quality of research. Once again, the field biologists have their own particular grievance with the standards of research at the college. Since a few field biologists have expressed their research in terms of environmental reports and public ordinances, they sometimes feel "a lack of recognition by many people who are straight researchers, both in the administration and in the department . . . ."

Two other related problems deserve mention. First, for a number of faculty at the assistant and associate professor levels, salaries are inadequate in an age of high inflation. As a result, a few biologists fill their extra-time with second jobs, or money-making projects, rather than pure research. While the heavy teaching load erodes research time during the fall and spring semesters, in the summer "sometimes money is so tight you've got to go back and teach, and it kills any possible research." Another, more cynical biologist, put it quite blatantly, "For another thing, some of the kinds of emphases that the promotion committee has now, I don't consider valid. Like the drive for publications, - I only publish if it pays."

The second problem is related to the salary question, and is aggravated by it. Collective bargaining, concerned essentially with issues of remuneration, teaching load, and administrative procedures, has not dealt adequately with the need for greater research time. Apart from released time, no other research-oriented issues have arisen in collective bargaining. In fact, the faculty union leadership has considered its defense of the four-course load (in the face of state demands for an increase) as a minor victory.

Situational Adjustments

State College biologists have developed a number of means of coping with the frustrations they encounter in trying to be professional teachers and researchers. These adjustments, while they might be made by individuals, are generally supported by the department as a group. This is especially true in regard to adjustments made to the mediocre quality of the student body. Adjustments made to research frustrations appear more isolated and less consensual.

"Ballbusters" yet "parents". There seems to be no doubt among the biology faculty that academic standards must be maintained regardless of the quality of the student body. Although some adjustments are apparent in terms of teaching style and course content, almost all faculty stressed the need to remain "demanding" and "hard-nosed" in their expectations of students. Most faculty would agree with the terse code of one biologist: "I give them the means. They must then apply the effort. I do not reward for nothing."

For most biologists, being hard-nosed involves maintaining standards of course work, underlined by rigorous grading procedures. While in many courses course content may be modified to reflect the heterogeneous intellects of the students, expectations regarding course work remain high. Similarly, there is general agreement that tough grading standards should be upheld as a department norm. This agreement appears to take the form of non-consensual sharing. For example, in regard to grading, one biologist noted that "without any type of collusion, or even discussion on our parts, usually we come out exactly identical for a particular group of students." Later on in the interview, he indicated similar agreement about maintaining standards: "Everyone comes to sort of an unspoken agreement as regards to holding the line."

Toughness and rigor, however, are not the only forms of adjustment. Most faculty indicated that they have become more personalized in their approach to teaching, making an effort to get to know as many students as possible. One department member described biology faculty as "ball-busters, but at the same time, we're parents. . . . The students know we're concerned about them." Since most faculty believe that the basic problem amongst students is lack of motivation, and personalized teaching undoubtedly represents a response to this shared perception. Getting to know a student well might be one way of discovering the key to personal motivation.

These are the primary adjustments to the mediocrity of the student body. Others were also mentioned in the course of the interviews which struck a chord with similar comments we heard in other departments. One professor said that he had come to accept the dullness of many students, while anticipating the few good students he would get in independent study. Another professor referred to his attempts to make lectures funnier and more entertaining in order to hold ever-straying student attention. Obviously, this form of adjustment, full of anguish and frustration, was far from satisfactory:

> It's a problem for me in the sense that my stomach sort of churns over. I do my goddamned best and I tend to ham it up just to keep those kids interested, and I go overboard

> sometimes. I throw in what I call 'gee-whiz biology'. . . . I don't know why our kids today are so blase. I'm working myself up to a climax and I look out there and a lot of the students are just staring off into space, and I think, my God, what's happening to me? I can't affect these kids anymore.

Research adjustments. Teaching is the primary, and most visible activity of State College biologists. It is also the one activity which all department members necessarily share, since some faculty are not involved in research. Thus, there are also more frequent references to adjustments made to teaching problems, and these adjustments are more frequently shaped by group experience. Research adjustments, on the other hand, are less commonly indicated, and are more typically individualistic.

The few references to research adjustments suggest a fact which is not surprising: it is very difficult to maintain consistent research efforts. Eight of the eleven biologists we interviewed had a history of research, but only five at most indicated any kind of current research involvements. For some, like the environmentalists, research efforts were made more difficult because they usually had to be confined to the weekends. For younger faculty, research was inhibited by the need to use free time to earn money. Under these difficult circumstances one faculty member asserted, he was thankful that his small reputation was "enough to keep my ego intact." This form of adjustment - doing enough research to maintain one's sense of full professionalism - seemed typical of the research-oriented faculty in this department.

In order to sustain even a minimal research commitment, biology faculty take advantage of the few opportunities available to them at State College. Many of them have sought and received the limited amounts of released-time which are granted (no more than two courses for a semester). The laboratory scientists make frequent use of college lab facilities which, most agree, are adequate. Generally, these biologists have established modest research goals to match the time and facilities available to them.

A minority - perhaps the most ambitious researchers - have sought outside assistance. Two have received federal grants, and at least seven retain contacts with faculty at research institutions. Some department members are able to use the facilities of two research-oriented universities which are nearby. They also attend seminars which are periodically held at these institutions, despite the snobbishness they sometimes encounter. (Faculty at a a nearby presitgious university treat them, one professor noted, "as if they are helping out their under-privileged brothers.") These outside contacts, as well as attendance at professional meetings, are particularly important to those faculty who feel isolated in their research pursuits.

Collegial relationships generally support, and certainly do not oppose, these types of situational adjustment. Obviously, the disagreement amongst biology faculty about what constitutes legitimate research affects their attitudes towards certain kinds of adjustments. A lab-oriented biologist might have little encouragement for a colleague who seeks released-time to write an environmental report for county government. However, their disagreements have less to do with the adjustment itself than with the end to which it is used. In general, the department's research orientation along with its loyalty to norms of academic freedom lead to support and tolerance of adjustments in the name of research.

From what we could learn, this support process corresponds to the image of informal work groups described earlier. The pursuit of research interests is generally a private matter, receiving intermittent support from colleagues. Encouragement is often unspoken - to the extent it exists. Collegial support emanates sporadically and nonverbally from a department marked by fragmentation and individualism.

Truncated careers

A serious problem is brought on by the state's limitations on the number of tenured positions allocated to each of the state colleges each year. The situation is so restrictive that State College biologists fear that no matter how good a young person may be in terms of research productivity, they may not be able to achieve tenure.

The situation is dramatically apparant to State College biologists. They have two highly valued, productive and personable young people who are about to come up for tenure decisions. Everyone seems to agree that if the first one to come up is, in fact, given tenure, the one coming up the following year will not. The College Appointments and Promotions committee simply won't allow both to get through. It is an agonizing situation for everyone because there is a strong desire to keep both and a strong belief that they would both make major contributions to the department.

The situation has prompted senior members to consider early retirement. But with the inflation rate being what it is, the financial sacrifice would be too great. There is an empathy with the youthful members and an admiration of them. The system at State College simply does not offer them sufficient opportunity for full career development. This is stark contrast to Private College where faculty agreed that outstanding young professors did have excellent chances at promotion and tenure.

Chapter Six

Business Economists

The business schools at both Private and State College are experiencing very different kinds of problems than the liberal arts schools at these institutions. Due to recent trends towards student vocationalism, enrollments in business-related departments have risen dramatically, in stark contrast to declines within the liberal arts. This rise in enrollments has created a set of growth problems for the finance departments at both State and Private College. Larger classes and heavy teaching schedules have contributed to difficulties for professors at both institutions.

Unlike the situation in liberal arts, where there were few jobs and many qualified applicants, within finance there is a lack of qualified applicants for available teaching positions. This fact translates into greater opportunities for job mobility for professors of finance. However, because of the relative inflexibility of both faculty lines and pay scales at both colleges, no adequate response to these changes in the job market has resulted. Consequently, there is considerable frustration within the ranks of finance faculty.

Although the situations at both Private and State college have certain similarities, the overall differences between these institutions are more significant. Likewise, professors of finance at these two colleges define even similar problems in different terms, and have developed correspondingly different attitudes towards them.

State College Business Economists

State College has met the high student demand for majors in business by becoming more selective in its admission of students. Therefore economics department majors at State College tend to be above the school average, and finance professors agree that there is no problem with marginally prepared students. However, students are still considered to be less than ideal by most members of the department. The major complaint against students is that they are difficult to motivate and as one professor at State College remarked:

> . . . they tend to be students who have never thought in terms that are really somewhat detached from themselves, in terms of world issues, state issues . . .

Professors of economics at State College are more content-oriented than student-oriented. They see the department as a service department, supplying non-majors, most of whom are in some other major within the business school, with the necessary understanding of the economic system. This constitutes one major teaching goal. A second goal is to supply the small but growing number of economics majors with "as much information as possible, so that they can go on to graduate school and also be a practitioner", as one professor explained.

Most professors maintain a professional distance from students. This distance coincides with a respect for the students, in that students are expected to be able to take care of themselves. A prime example of this respectful but distant professional attitude can be seen in professors' attitudes toward students' vocationalism. While it is generally accepted that too much vocationalism is harmful to students, professors do not consider it a problem within their realm of responsibility, but rather as involving a student's own personal decision.

Overall, the school of business at State College is a demanding one, and this fact applies to the finance department. High standards are maintained and grade inflation is not considered a problem. These norms are certainly related to the abundance of student applicants to the school of business.

Interestingly, there exists within the finance department the belief that limiting admissions to the business school because of limited resources is indeed a problem. One professor remarked:

> The problem is that we are turning away in my estimation, a lot of

> qualified students who could be a success.

This inability of State College to respond to high student demand by expanding enrollments is related to other problems within the finance department, especially the recruitment of new faculty as well as the retention of existing faculty. These problems have several dimensions, involving institutional inflexibility, union contracts, and the state's control of the college.

Institutional inflexibility refers mainly to the administration's policy of selective admissions in the face of high student demand. Expansion is the obvious solution to those members of the finance department who maintain a basic market analysis of the situation. The administration's stance on the issue is therefore viewed as a problem, as illustrated by the comments of one professor:

> You know, I think a college just like any other business has to respond to market demands. I don't think they /the administration/ should devote, you know, swing in that direction completely because these are subject to cyclical variations, but I think you should go with the winner at least, instead of turning away, in my estimation some of the people we've been turning away. . .

Pay scales are negotiated by the union for the entire college without taking into consideration that situations differ within individual departments. Moreover, the union is not strong enough to negotiate healthy salary increases. Low starting salaries in a high demand market, create a situation in which it is difficult to recruit qualified new business economists. A lack of sufficient wage increases also makes it difficult to retain experienced economics professors. Opportunities elsewhere become extremely inviting, and the faculty turns over all too frequently.

High faculty turnover rates are further aggravated by heavy teaching loads. Heavy teaching loads and limited amounts of faculty released time limit the potential for research, thus causing an additional source of dissatisfaction.

Among these professors at State College there is also much discontent over promotion and tenure decisions. For one thing, there exists a bottleneck regarding tenure and promotion decisions resulting in part from a state-imposed quota. Promotion and tenure are therefore seen as being granted more on the basis of seniority then on merit by some department members. Promotions, some people believe, are awarded to those who have waited the longest rather than to those who are really the most deserving.

As mentioned, one strategy used for dealing with these major problems at State College is simply to leave, resulting in a high faculty turnover rate. Another is decreased institutional commitment. "Moonlighting", taking jobs as consultants or other positions outside the college,are regarded by finance professors as acceptable. Indeed, seeking additional monetary and psychic satisfactions outside the college is very nearly the norm.

Collegial relationships within the department appear loose knit, with relatively little social interaction between department members and little group discussion of common problems. There exists mutual toleration of differences in ideology and teaching practices. The atmosphere is perhaps best described as "live and let live." None of the professors indicated any major problems within the realm of departmental relations. All agreed that departmental members both respect and like one another despite differences in opinion.

During the course of interviewing one apparent exception to the generally loose knit nature of the department was revealed. At some point in the recent past all faculty members banded together to give support to a colleague experiencing a major personal problem. This collective action appears to have been undertaken willingly by every member of the department and all expressed a genuine personal concern for the individual to whom they had given aid.

Within the department there is little openness in dealing with interdepartmental conflicts. Most disagreements are voiced in private discussions between individual faculty members and the head of the department. There is a fear that personal confrontations with individuals who are perceived to have violated some professional norm will lead to an uncomfortable situation within the department. This is viewed as a problem by the chairman, who would rather see department members interact more directly with each other, as is illustrated by this quotation:

> Well first of all the people that we have in the department are very upfront. If they feel that there is a problem in another class or feedback, they will tell me. What I would prefer is for them to tell the individual. Then come to me afterward if there is a problem. I believe in due process and I think that due process starts with the alleged violator or whatever, confrontation . . . They are not reluctant to come to me. They are reluctant to go to the individual because of personal unpleasantness.

It is important to note that these professors tended to look outside for their reference groups. In discussing their work and student problems at State College, faculty often make comparisons with outside institutions, both academic and non-academic. Larger universities were often cited as references, as this quote illustrates:

> Well, it's true at colleges, most universities have a three course load. We have a four course load.

Private College

Private College has not been able to meet increased demand by students for admissions to the business school with the same selectivity as State College. Maintaining enrollments at Private College is a matter of great concern due to the college's dependence on the tuition dollar and because of the current dearth of students in the Liberal Arts school. Private College's administration has increased its admissions to the business school tremendously in an effort to equal out the college's need for revenue. One professor of economics used the analogy of pieces of a pie to illustrate the enrollment tuition dollar dilemma:

> I guess at the liberal arts school enrollments certainly have dropped. And that seems to be a major problem, because this place basically pays

> for itself by tuition, and if tuitions don't come in then something has to go somewhere . . . And of course it's a problem for individual departments. Now unfortunately, it's like a piece of pie. If the school stays static at 3500, then if it's not a problem for us. It is passed on to you. If you turn around and correct your situation, you probably pass the pie back to us. . .

Perhaps because selectivity in admissions has not been emphasized, the attitude toward students at Private College is much more negative than at State College. Most finance professors express great dissatisfaction with the quality of students, although it is acknowledged that the business departments generally receive better students than the rest of the college. The best students at Private College are seen as being able to stand up to any college's best. However, professors in economics see the greater part of their students as poor quality, with many being only marginally prepared for college. As one professor expressed himself:

> The best students, we do have best students you know. They work very hard, they have their pride and they always come to class. They are present

> whether or not you take attendence and so on. They want to go on to graduate school. But it is a very small minority.

In general, the attitude towards students at Private College is less respectful than at State College. This reveals itself in the general perception of students as being of poor quality, and also in the more intense suspicions and complaints about student cheating. As at State College, professors are more content-oriented than student-oriented. However, this "hard-nosed" kind of attitude is even more profound and impersonal at Private College, where students are expected to take care of themselves. As one professor indicated:

> If they fail, they fail. I don't give extra assignments. I haven't got the time frankly.

Motivating students is seen as a major problem by most members of the department. One professor suggested that many of Private College's students were there only under parental pressure, thus accounting for their lack of motivation.

Within the department most professors viewed student vocationalism as both prevalent and a problem. Vocationalism was generally linked to qualities lacking in students, as this quote illustrates:

> I think they think of themselves as vocationally and professionally oriented. They are not sophisticated enough to understand that being well read, being conversant with music or the performing arts may very well be an important quality when they got out of here in the professional world.

One professor differed sharply from his colleagues in respect to student quality. This professor viewed student quality as high and did not feel that motivating students was a problem. The less intellectual and more vocational outlooks of many students were seen as healthy and natural responses to current economic trends in the job market.

Because Private College has greatly expanded enrollments to the business school without being able to redistribute faculty lines significantly enough to ease the transition, class sizes are very large within the department. Overcrowded classes make it difficult for professors to effectively teach students. Large classes decrease the time that can be spent on research activities, which figure decisively in the promotion and tenure process. They also add greatly to the work load of professors, cutting down on the time available for reading, and leisure activities. Thus, overcrowded classes are a significant source of job dissatisfaction for professors at Private College. One professor felt it to be the major problem within the finance department:

> Too many students. Well, 160 some and I had 33 in an upperlevel, supposedly seminar course . . . . But I don't know, it's not even a matter of being popular -- it's just enrollments. They are just up there and they have to take so many finance electives. Most of us are pushing between 30 and 40 in every class in the upper division classes.

Given the limited resources of the college, faculty lines cannot be more equitably arranged within the college without damaging the viability of the liberal arts school. This fact creates hostility towards the liberal arts school among some professors of finance. They resent the liberal arts faculty for their greater chunks of released time and smaller classes. Moreover, they believe that their union contract unfairly protects the liberal arts school.

However, some members of the finance department hold another view of this matter. Some more humanist faculty members see maintaining the viability of the liberal arts school as vital to the quality of the college as a whole, regardless of the difficulties it causes for departments within the business school. One professor expressed the opinion that more liberal arts classes should be required of business students. He suggested that the current business curriculum, instituted in order to gain accreditation, may be less than intellectually sound:

> They [liberal arts faculty] are very sensitive to our new requirements which mean that our juniors and seniors now have very little scope for taking liberal arts electives. They are almost always jammed in the first two years. And this means that the liberal arts people are not getting as many people into some of their junior and senior level courses, elective courses, as they would like to get. And that's too bad. I'm not sure that our format is intellectually or educationally sound but that's what a business school is supposed to be says the [accrediting association] so we want into the club.

Because so much concern over maintaining enrollments exists at Private College, grade inflation is much more an issue than at State College, even within the over-enrolled economics department. These professors believe that other departments, especially within liberal arts compete for students by lowering standards. Only one economist admitted to engaging in the practice himself. One professor viewed grade inflation as an effective pragmatic approach to enrollment problems, even if not a desirable one. On the whole, the attitude in finance toward grade inflation is basically resigned, if not slightly bitter. As one professor described his own personal encounter with grade inflation: ". . . when I had the large number I could have flunked, the answer was grade inflation."

Charlatans, defined as popular professors whose courses were low in content and whose grading standards were low, were described as a slight problem by most members of this department. Students came away from a charlatan's course with less than adequate knowledge of the subject matter, and were therefore surprised by the more demanding nature of other professors' courses. It was agreed that such a person would not receive tenure or promotion. However, if promotion and tenure had already been received, little could be done to remedy the problem. The charlatan issue was generally defined in terms of students:

> A lot of people, charlatans, walking around don't know the first thing you are talking about, and they entertain

> a lot in class and the students have a good time, get a high grade and that's all they care about. It doesn't bother me as long as they, the students, realize from day one that I am not going to do that.

One professor believed that one can make a contribution even if one has failed to keep up with the field.

> We had a faculty member . . . a gentleman who died a few years ago . . . .Professionally, in terms of his professional background and training he had left completely behind . . . . A little more wisdom, I think and I came to realize that while he was not teaching the course material the rest of us were, he was providing a service to undergraduate students that the rest of us were not able to provide.

Within the economics department at Private College there is much discontent with the current union contract. Because the wage settlement covers all professors in all departments, salaries of professors in the department are not responsive to current market demands. There is a shortage of economics professors available to fill faculty positions, but salary scales negotiated by the union do not allow Private College to compete adequately on the market by offering higher salaries. The situation is nearly identical to that at State College, in that it is both difficult to retain existing faculty members and to attract qualified new ones. In addition the union contract is seen by some members of the department as benefiting those in liberal arts at the expense of the business school. While the contract has guaranteed liberal arts professors job security in the face of declining enrollments, it has not offered the necessary incentives and rewards to finance professors whose skills are currently in demand. The contract is also seen by some members a protecting those less active members of the faculty who have received tenure, particularly older members, while the younger faculty is left to do the work.

> The union - you probably won't like this - our union subsidized liberal arts at the expense of business. They made a big trade-off in job security versus salary. The business school had the security, we wanted the salary. We got neither. We got the security we already had, liberal arts got the security which they didn't have. We are all on the same salary merits of

> our job market opportunities. But, there is a lot of dismay about that.

Nevertheless, finance faculty do not view the union contract as wholly undesirable. For example, many see the contract as protecting academic freedom. There also is acceptance of the union as a necessary foil to the authority of the administration. As one professor noted:

> By union contract, no one has to be an ass kisser. And a lot of the young people are anything but ass kissers. They're rabble-rousers and they are still . . . still getting promoted. People are respecting them for speaking their minds. There is none of this, "can I carry the chairman's books from the parking lot to the business office."

Just as at State College, two of the basic strategies used to deal with the problems of the job situation are either to leave altogether or to decrease commitment. Decreased commitment is expressed in two basic forms: "moonlighting," and a lessening of work undertaken by professors for the college, other than basic duties - like committee work. There is general acceptance of this kind of decreased committment. One professor described the situation in this way:

> Nobody bothers you. They let you do your own thing. You can leave your motor running while you're teaching class and get in your car as soon as the bell rings. No one keeps track of you here. I love it.

Like their counterparts at State College, professors of business economics tend to look outside their institution for reference groups. They often referred to "market conditions" in discussions of job dissatisfactions and working conditions.

Departmental relations are as loose knit at Private College as they are at State College, if not more so. As one professor described the departmental mood:

> This is not a close knit club. It's just one where people live and let live. And if you don't like the way Mr. X is doing something you don't worry about it.

Outside of the chairman, who is forced by his position to occasionally discuss problems with different professors, most discussions between department members take the form of commiseration about students. Occasionally professors teaching the same course may discuss course content, but otherwise contacts between professors of finance at Private College are few. As one department member put it:

> . . . at this part of the business school I think they usually keep to oneself. They don't usually discuss his problem or her problem. They manage to solve their own problems.

CHAPTER SEVEN

NURTURING THE ACADEMIC ETHOS

The Problems with Teaching Undergraduates in Perspective

In order to gain an overview of the problems described by the qualitative data, it is useful to present some of the quantitative information generated by the Potential Problems Inventory (PPI). As the reader may recall, the PPI catalogues aspects of professional, organizational, collegial and client relationships which the sociological literature suggested might be problems for professors in teaching colleges. Each professor was asked to indicate whether or not the statement was true within his or her department and college and then, if it was true, how serious a problem it really was. In order to simplify the following discussion, we shall distinguish between problems which are general (widespread across virtually all departments and both colleges), college specific, and department specific. We shall also distinguish between more or less successfully resolved problems, chronic unresolved problems and acute unresolved problems. It will become evident shortly that the most serious problems arise directly or indirectly from the dynamics of enrollment economics.

TABLE 7-1

Potential Professional Problems
(Percent in Agreement)

Potential Problem	History		Political Science		Biology		Economics		Total	
	PC[a]	SC[b]	PC	SC	PC	SC	PC	SC	PC	SC
(N)	(11)	(10)	(7)	(5)	(5)	(13)	(5)	(4)	(28)	(32)
Acute Problems										
Collective bargaining has not been very effective in resolving my most pressing professional problems	--	66	--	75	--	75	--	66	--	71
Career opportunities in this academic field are severely limited[c]	100	90	86	80	20	42	00	25	64	61
It is necessary for me to seek outside employment in order to support myself and my family	18	20	24	00	20	38	60	66	25	26
Chronic Problems										
One seldom receives professional recognition for excellence in teaching undergraduates	81	70	57	40	100	77	100	75	82	69
Professors at research universities seem to look down upon professors at this college	81	57	57	100	40	77	60	100	64	75
Undergraduate teaching has relatively low prestige compared to research and publication[c]	81	10	71	00	80	23	40	00	71	12
Morale among my colleagues is very low	36	10	43	00	80	09	60	00	43	06
Educational theory and research are not useful as guides for professors who are trying to become better teachers	27	50	14	00	40	54	40	00	29	35
Nonproblematic Issues										
Graduate training prepared me for research not teaching	72	40	86	60	80	61	40	100	61	59

[a] PC denotes Private College

[b] SC denotes State College

[c] Wording at State College was slightly different.

Only three acute professional problems were found. And these were at the college and department levels.

Many State College professors indicated that "Collective bargaining has not been very effective in resolving my most pressing professional problems." These pressing problems went beyond the usual union issues of wages and working conditions to include instructional supplies and both the quantity and quality of students. In general State College professors felt that the local and state union leadership worked hard on their behalf but that they were simply not powerful enough to bargain effectively with the state legislature which ultimately held the purse strings. Private College professors had a quite different opinion of their union's effectiveness. Because we had not set out to study the union role in resolving teaching problems, the same question was not asked at Private College. However the Private College respondents made it clear that they believed that their union had been very successful and they were quite appreciative of the fact. So while this issue was considered quite serious at State College, it was not at all a problem at Private College.

As anticipated, restricted career opportunities constituted a severe problem in the departments of history (representing the humanities) and political science (representing the social sciences) at both colleges. Several young professors indicated that they felt trapped in their college and that they wished the opportunities for mobility -- either upward or even horizontal -- were much greater within academia. But older faculty also were concerned, especially about the career prospects of young faculty members who did not achieve tenure. Cutting across the generation gap was a regret that it no longer seemed correct to urge bright young undergraduates to go to graduate school and seek an academic career -- the prospects for success just seemed too dismal.

Interestingly, the need to supplement income through outside employment was considered serious only within the Business Economics departments. At both colleges economists generally commanded a higher than normal entering salary. But after hiring they were tied to the same increments which the unions negotiated for all other departments. Thus, the economists were prevented from taking advantage of the tide of undergraduate vocationalism and the resultant seller's market available to individuals with Ph.D. degrees in economics. Furthermore, the economists were keenly aware that they could earn much more outside of academia. Opportunities for consultation and other business sidelines were relatively plentiful and the economists took advantage of them. Still many would clearly have preferred to earn "appropriate" professional salaries. Perhaps, but not certainly, they would then abandon their sidelines.

Several chronic unresolved problems were found. The two general ones were: "One seldom receives professional recognition for excellence in teaching undergraduates," and "Professors at research universities seem to look down upon professors at this college." Although they said that these were not serious problems, many professors clearly regreted the fact that they could not gain greater recognition for their teaching efforts. Virtually all understood the difficulties in defining and measuring the quality of teaching. Most simply took that as a fact of academic life. They adjusted to the sporadic rewards that come from interactions with students in their classrooms and offices. Even those professors who had received a local award for outstanding teaching were uncertain about its meaning. The criteria used for selecting winners were based on the quantity of positive student nominations and therefore made it impossible for excellent teachers with small classes to gain recognition. A few professors did express resentment about snobbery. But more were resigned to the fact that those employed at the top of the academic hierarchy will inevitably feel superior to those beneath them. One senior professor indicated that the major research universities were the academic big leagues, most state universities the minor leagues, and small colleges the little leagues. He accepted that without apparent bitterness. It was harder for the younger faculty to accept this definition of the situation, especially because many junior faculty had earned Ph.D. degrees from highly respected research universities. In better times such individuals would have found employment in research-oriented universities. They resented the snobbery because they felt that it was unfair and inappropriate to judge them on the basis of their institutional affiliation. Despite their denials it is hard to see how college professors can be unaffected by the lack of recognition and actual denigration of undergraduate teaching -- that is, after all, their primary professional role.

Two college-specific chronic unresolved problems -- "Undergraduate teaching has relatively low prestige compared to research and publication" and "Morale among my colleagues is very low" -- were found. Whereas 71 percent of Private College professors agreed with the former statement, only 12 percent of the State College professors agreed. On the latter measure 43 percent of Private College professors reported low morale among colleagues as compared to only six percent of State College professors. The interviews indicated that there was some tie between these two, that is the stress on research productivity at Private College depressed some teaching-oriented professors. But other factors dealing with organizational, collegial and client relationships had a greater impact upon morale.

It was somewhat surprising that so few professors agreed that "Educational theory and research are not useful as guided for professors who are trying to become better teachers." We had expected widespread denigration of the practical utility of educational psychology -- reflecting the attitudes found in so many graduate schools. But it must be remembered that a significant number of these professors, especially the older ones, had originally been trained as secondary school teachers and had moved up to college teaching during the decades of rapid expansion in the 1950's and 1960's. Others had wives who were school teachers and said that they had learned some useful things about educational theory and research from them. Of course, it is possible that many of those who did not agree were simply conforming to the professional norm, "Thou shalt not criticize a colleague." In any case in half of the departments 40 percent or more did indicate that weakness in the knowledge base of teaching was an unresolved problem.

There was one general problem which could be classified as basically resolved, "Graduate training prepared me for research, not teaching." Overall 60 percent agreed with the statement, but no one felt that it was a continuing problem. Some were frank in indicating that they struggled for a period of time trying to find a teaching style that was comfortable and apparently effective. But all felt that they had been able to overcome the fact that they had not been trained to teach. Of course, their students might not agree with their assessment of the situation.

Organizational Problems

Organizational problems are those which stem from the fact that college professors are not free professionals, but employees who work within complex, formal organizations. These problems turned out to be especially vexing for our respondents.

Insert Table 7-2 about here

The conflict between professional obligations and organizational duties as tapped by the statement, "The teaching load makes it difficult for me to keep up with my feild," was a general and acute problem. At Private College 75 percent of the professors agreed while at State College 55 percent agreed. The difference in percentages may reflect the fact that research productivity is given greater emphasis at Private College than at State College. Thus Private College professors may feel greater pressure to keep up with their fields. Of course, keeping current in one's field is central to the academic ethos in general. Those professors who are primarily teachers are also interested in keeping current in order to give students the best possible view of developments in their field.

Eighty-two percent of the Private College professors (as compared to only 35 percent at State College) reported that "Maintaining enrollments is a matter of overriding concern here." This is a clear, quantitative indicator of the problem so often referred to in the preceding chapters. There can be no doubt that the dynamics of the enrollment economy are highly salient and worrisome at Private College. In an institution which has a

TABLE 7-2

Potential Organizational Problems
(Percent in Agreement)

Potential Problem	History		Political Science		Biology		Economics		Total	
(N)	PC[a] (11)	SC[b] (10)	PC (7)	SC (5)	PC (5)	SC (13)	PC (5)	SC (4)	PC (28)	SC (32)
Acute Problems										
The teaching load makes it difficult for me to keep up with my field.	90	40	71	60	80	58	40	75	75	55
Maintaining enrollments is a matter of overriding concern here.[c]	90	50	71	40	80	25	80	25	82	35
Even an outstanding young professor would have little chance of achieving promotion and tenure.	00	20	00	20	00	58	00	75	00	42
Classes are too large to permit the individualized instruction that I would like to offer.	18	00	29	20	00	31	80	00	29	16
Chronic Problems										
It's hard to know just how important research and publication are considered to be by the administration.	54	40	71	40	80	46	40	50	61	44
Nonproblematic Issues										
I am often obliged to teach courses which are peripheral to my research interests.	72	40	43	20	20	15	40	25	50	25
No one at this college shares my specialized professional interests.	45	50	14	40	80	61	00	25	36	50
There is pressure from both students and administrators to relax standards of excellence to keep students from flunking out.[c]	27	00	29	20	40	15	00	00	25	10
Administrative regulations prevent me from teaching the way I would under ideal conditions.	00	20	00	20	00	17	00	25	00	20

[a] PC deontes Private College

[b] SC denotes State College

[c] Phrasing at State College was slightly different

minimal endowment and is heavily dependent upon tuition dollars for current expenses, when students begin to turn their backs on the liberal arts departments, the viability of the college's multi-purpose mission is called into doubt. The professors may resent that they are being asked to "pay their way" by demonstrating high enrollments, but the fiscal realities cannot be totally ignored. Again, State College has a more secure political-economic base, so enrollment pressures are less acute.

One problem proved acute only in the Biology and Economics departments of State College: "Even an outstanding young professor would have little chance of achieving promotion and tenure." These departments had had direct and recent experience with the harsh reality that tenured faculty lines are being severely rationed at the present time. Some of those professors feel that there is simply little or no room at the top and that competition between departments for promotions is largely determined by politics and quotas rather than by individual merit or the dynamics of the academic marketplace.

Only the State College economists complained about having classes which were too large to offer individualized instruction. They felt that it was their sorry lot to have to pick up the slack produced by declining enrollments within the liberal arts division. Thus, they were not allowed to limit the size of even their specialized courses. Within the other departments small classes were considered to be the only redeeming feature of the current wave of student vocationalism.

Unclear and confused goals are, indeed, chronic problems at both colleges, but especially at Private College. The statement was, "It's hard to know just how important research and publication are considered to be by the administration." At Private College the respondents suggested that they received mixed messages. On the one hand they were exhorted to be active researchers and publishers. On the other hand resources in support of grant-getting were scarce and a four-course teaching load sabotaged most efforts at legitimate research. Furthermore, the administrative assertion that they were interested in "scholarly activity" rather than in professional publication confused the matter further. This broader definition of desireable professional activity meant that people who did not publish had a relatively good chance of getting promoted. Although a publishing criterion might lead to an emphasis on quantity, rather than quality, at least it is relatively clear. As things stand at Private College, if a junior member has the full support of his or her department, can provide some evidence of good teaching (not necessarily student evaluations) and some evidence of scholarly activity, (including, possibly, research note cards) the chances of achieving promotion and tenure are very good.

Half of the Private College professors as compared to only a quarter of the State College professors agreed that, "I am often obliged to teach courses which are peripheral to my research interests." Given the salience of research productivity norms at Private College, it is somewhat surprising that those professors generally did not consider that a problem. Instead several indicated that they enjoyed the opportunity to extend their knowledge in areas previously unknown to them. By and large they did not resent the great amount of preparation time required to teach these "peripheral" courses.

Similarly although the potential problem of professional isolation ("No one at this college shares my specialized professional interests") was fairly widespread, especially at State College, this was not considered a real problem. The major reason was that both colleges were located in the midst of a megalopolis rich in institutions of higher education. Many professors had established contacts with colleagues at other institutions which helped them overcome the potential problem of isolation.

Neither of the other potential organizational problems was widely recognized. Surprisingly in light of all that we have found about the workings of the enrollment economy, few professors reported feeling pressure from students and administrators to relax standards in order to keep students from flunking. Although students do exert such pressures, administrators _in their official pronouncements_ do not. However, the alleged administrative preoccupation with enrollment statistics conveys a different message. Because the question as phrased was ambiguous, the figures are misleading. We have much more confidence in the qualitative data generated by interviewer probes. Only five professors suggested that administrative regulations interfered with their academic freedom. These were concerned about the rigidity of class scheduling.

Problems with Student-Clients

Eight out of ten of the professors interviewed felt that the quality of many of their students was poor. Their lack of preparation, motivation and serious scholarly attitude was mentioned over and over again. Only in the highly selective State College Business Economics department was this view uncommon. The lack of preparation was, of course, blamed largely on the high schools. But problems with motivation and attitude were perhaps even more serious. Private College professors were especially unhappy about the party atmosphere on campus generally and especially in the dormitories and fraternities. Apparently students were in the habit of taking long weekends, starting with Thursday as a heavy drinking night. That essentially ruled out Friday as an effective learning day for many students. The local reputation of the college as a "party school" contributed to what one professor called an "institutional inferiority complex." And the faculty perception that admissions standards had been lowered or, perhaps even eliminated, made the matter worse. Although State College professors were aware of their administration's attempts to improve the quality of the student body, they were as critical of student quality as were the Private College professors. Professors at both colleges were quick to point out that their best students matched the best students at the most selective schools, but that those highly prized students were rare.

Insert Table 7-3 about here

Attesting once again to their uniqueness within this sample of professors, only the economists were likely to agree that "After a few years teaching loses its challenge and excitement." Other professors were likely to deny that and to assert that each new class was a new challenge to be met. Perhaps the economists were simply more candid, or perhaps the reality of potentially lucrative opportunities outside of academia made the economists somewhat sour about teaching.

Two general chronic problems emerged. The first is what Lortie (1975) has called the "authorship" problem. Its essence is caught by the statement presented to the professors, "In the great majority of cases a professor cannot know whether or not she/he has had a real impact upon a student." If improvement is noted, and that is rare in the large classes, the professor cannot be sure why the change for the better has occurred. It

TABLE 7-3

Potential Problems with Students
(Percent in Agreement)

Potential Problem	History		Political Science		Biology		Economics		Total	
(N)	PC[a] (11)	SC[b] (10)	PC (7)	SC (5)	PC (5)	SC (13)	PC (5)	SC (4)	PC (28)	SC (32)
Acute Problems										
Many students here are inadequately prepared for college level work[c] and are too vocationally oriented.	81	100	86	60	40	64	60	25	79	69
After a few years teaching loses its challenge and excitement.	00	14	00	20	00	33	60	50	11	31
Chronic Problems										
In the great majority of cases a professor cannot know whether or not she/he has had a real impact upon a student.	100	70	43	80	80	42	100	75	82	61
The students vary so much in terms of motivation, interests and ability that it is very hard to teach large classes.	81	100	43	80	40	73	60	75	64	86
Nonproblematic Issues										
Student evaluations of teaching are taken too seriously here.	18	00	00	20	00	36	20	25	14	21

[a] PC denotes Private College

[b] SC denotes State College

[c] Wording at State College was slightly different.

might have more to do with improved study habits, dating patterns, familial relationships or any number of factors other than the professors' efforts. While acknowledging that the problem does exist, the professors reminded us that in most cases their upper-division classes were in fact very small and did allow them to monitor the progress of their students. The biologists, who worked closely with the students in laboratory situations, were especially likely to have enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing their students grow under their tutelege. Still, the fact remains that professor-student relations are seldom very close and that professors in general have only very sporadic psychic gratification derived from positive student feedback. Under these circumstances the professors are strongly motivated to establish personalistic ties with at least a few "good" students. Some want to "know", "understand," and "relate" to some average students also. They reason that it may only be possible to motivate these students intellectually when the traditional professor-student social distance is reduced. The heterogeneity of classes was the other general chronic problem ("The students vary so much in terms of motivation, interests and ability that it is very hard to teach large classes"). Here again although the problem is real and unresolved it is also limited because large lecture classes are few and small seminar-type classes are many.

A quite surprising result was found regarding the potential problem of "influential amateurs" (Hughes 1917: 346). Hughes pointed out that teachers, doctors, musicians and other professionals have to deal with the reality that their work is judged by amateurs. Official student evaluations of teaching had often been conducted at both colleges. Yet we found virtually no trace of the professional resentment which Hughes' observations had led us to expect. On the one hand, many professors felt that it was legitimate for students to make judgements of teaching style, if not content, because they were, in fact, those most familiar with and most directly affected by that style. On the other hand it appeared that many were willing to tolerate the student evaluations because they had been reduced to essentially meaningless rituals. The Private College union had successfully bargained for strong safeguards on the use of student ratings in appointments and promotions decisions. Although the contract did provide for the regular collection of student evaluations it also stipulated that they could only be taken into account in personnel decisions if the professors involved wanted to include them. Other evidence of quality teaching such as collegial evaluations or unsolicited letters of praise from individual students could be substituted for the formal evaluations. A similar situation prevailed at State College. In neither case did the official student evaluations seem to serve much more than a ritualistic function. Because they desired and requested student opinions of their teaching styles, several Private College professors constructed and administered their own private questionnaires. They felt that these unofficial instruments were much more meaningful and helpful than were the official ones. In any case student preferences as expressed by enrollment statistics clearly were highly influential, if not effecting the fate of individual professors, certainly in determining the future growth or decline of departments and divisions. So although the "influential amateur" problem as it is manifested in formal student evaluations has been largely resolved, the more basic manifestation of consumer influence through course selection has not been resolved. Again this appears to be the core acute problem within these colleges.

Problems in Collegial Relationships

The two general acute problems in collegial relationships--charlatans and unfair interdepartmental competition for students--were both related to the problem of declining enrollments. At Private College there was widespread recognition that "Some very popular teachers are charlatans." This is a striking finding given the fact that professionals are generally reluctant to criticize their colleagues and especially so since this criticism is so very basic and severe. On the one hand individuals who were great entertainers but weak scholars were resented and rejected as deviants from the academic ethos. On the other hand it is also true that within departments experiencing declining enrollments there was a certain appreciation of the fact that the charlatan's popularity contributed to the department's quota of student credit hours. Thus, the attitude was clearly ambivalent. Although tolerance is a great academic virtue, the charlatan by definition exceeds the boundaries of "professional" behavior and should, therefore, be sanctioned. Rapidly declining enrollments make it more unlikely than ever that informal social control will be exercised, however. This is a demoralizing predicament.

Insert Table 7-4 about here

On the interdepartmental level there is also a phenomenon akin to charlatanism -- artificially inflating grades in order to attract students. In both colleges there were certain departments which were notorious for giving easy grades. It was noted that these were among those departments suffering from the most dramatic enrollment declines. The professors concluded that the easy grading was basically unfair competition. But once again the mechanisms for control over the phenomenon were extremely weak being essentially nothing more than administrative cajoling. Generally speaking the professors did not feel that it was their place to try to control the behavior of their colleagues in other departments. Any attempts on their part would invite retaliation. If anyone should attempt to control grade inflation, it should be the administration. It is significant that no one questioned the potential effectiveness of easing up on grades as a way of attracting students. The professors' negative view of most students as not only unprepared but also slothful and hedonistic, led them to believe that most students would avoid demanding courses whenever possible.

TABLE 7-4

Potential Professional Problems
(Percent in Agreement)

Potential Problem	History		Political Science		Biology		Economics		Total	
(N)	PC[a] (11)	SC[b] (10)	PC (7)	SC (5)	PC (5)	SC (13)	PC (5)	SC (4)	PC (28)	SC (32)
Acute Problems										
Some very popular teachers are charlatans*	54	50	71	00	66	36	60	25	61	33
Some departments compete for students by giving easy grades.	27	100	57	60	60	66	20	75	39	76
Chronic Problems										
Younger faculty members approach their professional duties quite differently than oldtimers.	36	11	43	20	80	69	60	100	50	45
Professors seldom discuss teaching problems, materials or techniques with one another.	18	44	29	20	80	46	40	25	36	39

[a] PC denotes Private College

[b] SC denotes State College

[c] Wording at State College was slightly different.

Departments varied dramatically on the two other collegial problems probed at both colleges -- generational differences and amount of discussion of teaching problems. Overall the differences in professional practice between younger and older faculty members were not considered serious. Some younger faculty members criticized their elders for not keeping up while some senior faculty criticized junior members for inadequate dedication to the department and college as opposed to the union, research and/or discipline. But it was only in those instances where the differences were so great that charlatanry was alleged to be involved that the issues generated much emotion. Contrary to our expectations, only slightly more than one-third of the professors at both colleges reported that "Professors seldom discuss teaching problems, materials or techniques with one another." Working on the basis of observations in research-oriented universities, we thought there would be very little discussion of pedagogical matters and that this might prove to be a severe problem. Discussion of problems and shop talk was often within cliques or other kinds of small groups, intra- or inter-departmental. Interestingly, only within the Private College biology department (perhaps the most research-oriented department of all) was minimal discussion of teaching considered a problem. Clearly most professors in these teaching-oriented colleges were able to find at least some colleagues who would engage in shop talk.

From the Academic to the Market Ethos

In summary, these findings suggest that enrollment economics pose the most acute problems facing these college professors today, possibly endangering the values embodied in the academic ethos. There appears to be a shift from the traditional academic ethos to a market ethos. This threatens the usual patterns of relationship between the professor and the discipline, the college, the students and colleagues.

The academic ethos emphasizes the goal of contributing to a discipline by doing original, often highly theoretical and abstract, research. The emergent market ethos emphasizes meeting student demand for practical, applied, vocationally relevant courses. The market ethos also suggests that given the nature of consumer interests and the need to maximize enrollments, under-enrolled courses ought to be revised and new courses ought to be devised with the aim of attracting more students. Furthermore, as the market exerts pressure for more attention to the fiscal realities of the local scene, the cosmopolitanism engendered by research activity may be undercut. It would seem that if the level and direction of faculty effort is to change in the direction of meeting student-consumer demand, many professors will feel that their research goals are being frustrated.

Ideally the formal organizational setting of academic work would nurture the academic ethos. Unfortunately it is not clear that these two colleges were completely effective in promoting academic values. It is not just that the teaching loads were heavy, making it difficult to keep up with new developments in one's field. That is perhaps inevitable. More serious are the problems deriving from ambiguous organizational goals and reward systems. Many professors reported that they found it very hard to comprehend administrative priorities regarding research and teaching. They felt that the idealistic exhortations contained in official statements were at odds with certain policies and practices. Although grant-getting was supposedly valued, the organization did not commit adequate resources to facilitating the acquisition of outside research funds. Although faculty were urged to be tough graders, admissions standards were lowered (at Private College) and the requirements to remain a student were relaxed. And although teachers were told to hold rigorous standards, scarce and valued resources such as opportunities for appointments and promotions were apparently allocated on the basis of student demand. Again most professors would probably feel comfortable maintaining tough standards if they felt the college would recognize and reward them for this difficult task. Instead they felt that to act on the basis of such high ideals would be disasterous in terms of enrollments. Thus, the academic ethos and the market ethos were considered to be directly at odds.

The clash of the academic and market values also strains collegial relationships. Academic freedom is revered by college professors not only for its protection of free inquiry but also for its maximization of individual autonomy. The guiding principle is "Live and let live." College professors have traditionally enjoyed virtually complete freedom to teach their subjects as they please -- not as the students please. Typically department curricula grow and change as the interests of the professors change. Traditionally there is very little curricular planning or coordination. Ideally the curriculum reflects the growth of the discipline, not the interests of undergraduate students. When departmental enrollments decline sharply enough that they cannot be ignored, professors find themselves in the uncomfortable position of reviewing and examining the departmental offerings. This may entail a careful look at what goes on in particular courses and efforts to eliminate overlap and maximize coordination. When the members of a department have very different intellectual perspectives, philosophies of education and/or teaching styles, any effort at coordination will be particularly painful. When one or more members are rejected as charlatans it may be impossible to effectively address the problem because to do so would create such deep wounds that civil relationships could not be maintained. Faculty resentment of the market mentality which apparently values popularity above intellectual honesty may produce deepseated resentment. Most faculty will feel that charlatans should at best be tolerated -- certainly not honored as those who maximize enrollments. Of course, those who are able to maintain both intellectual integrity and high enrollments will be respected. The department chairman is crosspressured under these circumstances. The administration, operating on the basis of market ideals, will press for the elimination of small classes. The department members will fight to keep such courses arguing that these small courses represent new directions of the field or areas which are particularly stimulating from an intellectual point of view. Administrators are in a difficult position also. They presumably want to maintain academic standards, but they also need to meet shifting student demand. By allocating resources on the basis of enrollments they set up a competition between departments which has the potential of undercutting academic ideals.

Finally a shift from the academic to the market ethos may heighten tensions between professors and students. It is clear that professors have a strong preference for students who are well prepared and motivated for college level work. Such college students are fairly rare in the best of times, but when competition between colleges for students becomes intense as at present, admissions standards are likely to be lowered or abandoned entirely, making "good" students even more uncommon. The professors may resent having to deal with unprepared, indifferent or even hostile students. The professor's resentment may be displayed to the students -- producing a negative cycle of heightened classroom tension. As Shils has pointed out,

> The seriousness of the student is important to the seriousness of the teacher. This is the only worthwhile sense in which teachers and students form an intellectually sustaining community. It is not a matter of pleasing students: attempting to please them might require all sorts of supine and morally degrading flattery without intellectual substance. Meeting the demands of intellectually exacting students is a different thing. (1976: 174)

Clearly competing with other departments for inferior students was considered degrading by many Private College and State College professors.

Responses to Enrollment Declines

Now that the problems themselves have been summarized, it is time to discuss patterns of individual, departmental and collegiate responses to them. The dual problems of declining quality and quantity of students was of sufficient magnitude that it could not be simply ignored. Drawing upon the interview materials and supplementing them where necessary to fill in gaps, it is possible to tentatively identify responses which are socially defined as legitimate, illegitimate and questionable. This tentative sketching of the range of acceptable adaptations is anchored by Shil's conception of the academic ethos -- meeting the highest possible standards in scholarship and teaching.

First, let us discuss situational adjustments which might be made by individuals. It would be legitimate for a professor to react by:

1. Teaching subjects of intellectual interest to the professor and redoubling efforts to keep up to date with those areas.
2. Consulting with colleagues about new teaching techniques and materials.
3. Revising and improving the course syllabi.
4. Attempting to develop new teaching techniques which will engage the students more completely. This might involve the search for more effective examples or anecdotes or polishing one's speaking performance, for example.
5. Reaching out to individual students and attempting to develop personalistic relationships outside of class.
6. Reviewing course expectations and grading standards to see if they are appropriate for the clientele.

It would probably be considered inappropriate for a professor to:

1. Teach subjects which are of interest to students but not to the professor, especially those in which the professor has little expertise.

2. Strive to duplicate as closely as possible the teaching practices of successful colleagues.
3. Continue to teach from old notes, yellowed with age.
4. Concentrate on keeping the students engaged and entertained paying little attention to content.
5. Developing intimate, particularistic relationships with students that interfere with objective assessment of their work.
6. Radically reduce the level of demand put on students and give easy grades.

In between these extremes are grey areas. Which new topics are of serious academic worth and which are not? How much borrowing and emulation of colleagues is appropriate? In revising courses to what extent should one be guided by professional judgements as to what is good for the students as opposed to the students' view as to what is good for them? How far should one go in trying to engage or entertain students through anecdotes, demonstrations or innovative techniques such as simulation games? How much time should one spend with students outside of class? What is spoonfeeding and what is legitimate reaching out to students at their own level? What is the appropriate balance between coddling and flattering the students and giving them extremely stiff challenges that most are unlikely to meet? Is it truly legitimate to ease one's standards for weaker students while maintaining them for stronger ones? Although our respondents did not articulate these questions, it was clear that many were struggling to answer them.

Departmental responses might also vary. It would clearly be legitimate to conduct a thorough review of the curriculum and course scheduling attempting to maximize intellectual integrity, clarity and coordination while minimizing duplication. It probably would not be considered appropriate to conduct such a review with the sole aim of improving enrollments by meeting the students' conception of the ideal curriculum. But, in the grey area, are the questions, "Just how far should one go in meeting the students vocational interests?" and "Should we avoid scheduling Friday morning classes because so many students are hung over from drinking so much on Thursday nights?" If the department finds that student drinking is a problem, what is their responsibility in addressing that problem? Departments might find it appropriate to discuss and plan the long range direction of the department program. It might be considered inappropriate under the circumstances to continue past practices of avoiding planning and growing in an haphazard fashion. But how far should the department as a collective go in imposing its will upon members, or at least, constraining them? What, if any, limits should be put on the informal tradition of tolerating professors' desires to teach only in areas of intellectual interest to them? Departments might respond to declining enrollments by stepping up recruitment efforts. The departments studied here engaged in a variety of such efforts including instituting freshman seminars designed to attract majors, sending faculty out to high schools to give talks and perhaps recruit students, assigning a faculty member to maintain alumni contacts and work through alumni to identify prospective students, telephoning students who have been identified as considering enrolling at the college, and holding open houses or similar activities designed to advertize the program offered. Obviously false advertizing would not be considered legitimate nor, probably, would be leafletting in student registration lines. But questions were raised about whether or not the faculty should be involved in recruitment and, if so, what faculty and in what ways? Is it correct for junior members of the department to bear the brunt of such duties or should they be more evenly shared? Finally, departments might want to review the requirements of their service courses and for their major. The professors we spoke to seemed to feel that it was not legitimate to lessen the demands of service courses (by reducing the amount of required reading or dropping laboratories, for example).

Yet they saw other departments doing so and perhaps gaining enrollments in so doing. Again, to what extent is it legitimate to hold to old standards when the nature and quantity of students is decreasing?

The Carnegie Commission has expressed its concern about the possibility that intercollegiate competition for students will produce "unfair competition" by offering cut rate or second rate degrees of dubious quality (Carnegie Commission, 1979). Colleges may react to the very real and severe financial threat of declining enrollments by reducing degree requirements, initiating new programs built upon weak knowledge bases and transient student demand, giving credit where it is not due, retaining students who do not belong in college, advertizing in a false and misleading fashion and looking the other way at academic dishonesty on the part of students. Although faculty members might agree that these actions are contemptible, in concrete cases the decisions often will not be clear. Is this particular action cheapening the degree or adjusting appropriately to changing times? Is this proposed program "academically respectable" or not? How much credit should be given for learning outside the college context and what types of learning should be granted credit toward a degree? How often does a course have to be offered to be kept in the catalogue? Are the interests of the student and the college best served by giving this student a severe punishment for plagiarism?

In summary there apparently is a real need for articulation of the ethical issues facing individual professors, their departments and their colleges. Then there is a need for frank and open discussion of the issues aimed at delineating the range of acceptable responses. Individuals and committees must take these responsibilities seriously and be determined to maintain quality. This will be extremely difficult because of honest and deeply felt differences of opinion and the tradition of laissez-faire which prevails on most campuses. Painful as they might be, such discussions might have a very salutory effect and be worth the effort.

The Role of the Colleague Group

The departments we studied varied widely in their cohesiveness. The Private College history department was extraordinarily cohesive despite its compositional heterogeneity. At the other extreme the State College Political Science and Business Economics departments of both colleges were atomistic. In between were the other departments with varying degrees of cohesion and division into subgroups. Nonetheless we did find evidence that informal work groups did play an important role in determining the nature of responses to declining enrollments.

In other occupations and professions the informal work group provides individuals with a sphere of warmth, cooperation and social support and it is no different in academia. Not only did colleagues prove willing to help in times of crisis by taking over classes and offering sympathy, but they also acted just as friends do anywhere else during the routine of the academic year. Within these groups casual conversations touched on many work-related and unrelated topics. There was some consultation about teaching, but it was casual and entirely informal.

This primary group was more influential in defining the work situation than was either the department or college as a whole. Within the Private College history department the young turks and certain oldtimers developed quite contrasting interpretations about the nature and direction of the department. Yet at the same time it is true that the Private College historians taken as a group shared a very different definition of the college than the biologists, for example. The historians were very uncertain about the importance of research and publication to the administration while the biologists were certain in their own minds that these factors were absolutely crucial as far as appointments and promotions were concerned. It was as if in moving from the History department on one side of the quadrangle to the Biology department on the other, one was moving to an entirely different college. Thus, departmental colleagues as a whole and friendship groups within the department both help develop a shared interpretation of the environment.

Informal groups of professors also provided consensual validation or legitimation for deviance from the highest academic ideals. Within these groups it was agreed that very high levels of scholarly productivity could not be expected because the college and student resources were so limited. It was also agreed that it was desireable to concentrate on recruiting the very best students while the others got benign neglect. Friends also agreed among themselves that it would be fruitless and destructive to confront charlatans. And in at least one instance they apparently agreed that it was alright to reduce the number of failing grades while remaining stringent in requirements for top grades. This last is an example where the informal group validated a degree of deviance from ideal standards while at the same time defining the acceptable limits for such deviance. It would have been unacceptable to give half the students A's and the rest B's for example.

There was a limited degree of informal social control exerted by the colleague group. We found examples of attempts by biologists and historians to try to bring easy grading colleagues back into line. But that informal control was limited by concerns about interfering with academic freedom, violating the norm that "Thou shalt not offer unsolicited advice," and about undermining the limited self-confidence of colleagues. There was some protection of the inept, but there was also evidence of informal attempts to protect clients from the inept department members. The Private College historians tried to steer promising students away from those they considered charlatans.

Finally, although our research was designed to focus on the role of informal departmental work groups, we were struck by the fact that such groups are also the basis for formal groups--

committees and, especially, unions. At Private College an informal group of historians formed the activist leadership core of the union. Thus, the distinction between informal colleague groups and formal ones may often break down in practice.

The Importance of Leadership

Administrative, departmental and union leaders play a key role in determining faculty responses to enrollment declines. As we have said the market ethos threatens to supplant the traditional academic ethos. Academic values are particularly precarious when:

1. Organizational goals are ambiguous, multiple, contradictory and contested.
2. Policies regarding student admission and retention and professorial appointment, promotions and rewards are not consistent with official policy statements.
3. The student culture either does not support, or worse, actively resists the faculty culture.
4. Departments are only very loosely coupled, competition between units for scarce resources is intense, evaluation systems are weak and reward systems inappropriate.

This suggests that academic leaders can help bolster academic values in several ways. They can debate and attempt to find consensus on what the college, division and departmental goals should be. If they are successful, and that is by no means certain, it could be a very important first step. Then it would be appropriate to have a thorough review of policies and procedures to identify and eliminate circumstances in which the official and operational goals diverge. Attempts might be made not just to adjust to but actively reshape the student culture. Again this is no simple task. Finally, a leadership council might address anew the old problems of promoting interdepartmental cooperation rather than competition, strengthening evaluation system and redesigning reward systems so that excellence in teaching might be better rewarded.

The Happy College Professor

From our interviews and analysis it is possible to construct a portrait of the blissfully happy college (as opposed to university) professor. In our view such a professor would share with the institutional leadership belief that teaching undergraduates is a serious, honorable and demanding task. That is, the individual acts on the basis of goals which are consistent with the fact that she or he is employed by an institution which is primarily concerned with undergraduate teaching. This is certainly not to say that the professor would have no ambition to make a contribution to the discipline through research, only that it is recognized that a teaching-oriented institution can allocate only limited amounts of its resources to the facilitation of research. Therefore, faculty productivity will necessarily be lower than it might be in a major university. Such a professor might dream of mobility from the college but would recognize that it is highly improbable, if not impossible. This professor would work within an organizational environment which has clear and relatively uncontested goals as well as policies, evaluation procedures and reward systems which are consistent with those goals. Interdepartmental relationships are positive and cooperative with each group recognizing the legitimacy of the others. Close and supportive friends exist who help to maximize his or her teaching effectiveness. And, of course, the professor has an adequate supply of capable, well-prepared and well-motivated students.

It sounds utopian, too good to be true. That is because the present reality is so very different. Perhaps now that these discrepancies have been articulated we can see the beginnings of a movement to nurture the academic ethos within teaching-oreinted colleges.

APPENDIX:

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

1. The purpose of this research is to gather basic information about the difficulties which college professors face in performing their instructional duties and the ways in which they cope, both individually and collectively, with those difficulties.

2. The procedure. All the members of the History, Biology and Business Economics departments will be interviewed. You will be asked a series of questions dealing with the following topics: biographical and career information, problems in undergraduate teaching, strategies for coping with such problems and teaching methods and assignments. The interviews will be tape recorded as a supplement and check for my notes.

3. The risks. It is possible that in answering these questions some sensitive information may be revealed. However, stringent safeguards will be employed to protect your anonymity. No one other than myself will have access to the interview tapes. All interview schedules, consent forms, lists of respondents and tapes will be kept under lock and key. The tapes will be erased and all other records will be destroyed upon completion of the project. Results will be analyzed and reported in terms of general categories such as: members of college faculty A vs. members of faculty B and historians vs. biologists. These precautions minimize the risk that others will be able to identify your position on any given issue.

4. The benefits. It is important to you and your colleagues that the difficult conditions which undergraduate teachers face be more widely recognized. The result should be a more widespread sympathetic understanding of your work. Also, knowledge about how you and your colleagues cope with problems posed by the social contexts of your work may serve to stimulate further research and may suggest modifications of existing policies which will improve working conditions and instructional effectiveness.

5. The right to withdraw. You have the right to terminate the interview at any time. You also have the right to refuse to answer any question which is part of the interview.

6. Opportunity to ask questions. If at any time during the interview you want clarification or further information, you are entitled to seek it. I will provide such information to the best of my ability without biasing your responses.

HAVING READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE INFORMATION
ABOVE, I WILLINGLY CONSENT TO THIS INTERVIEW.

____

COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS, FACULTY CULTURES AND UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

Advance Questionnaire

I. Information on Your Academic Career

1. Please list (beginning with the most recent) the academic degrees which you have been awarded, the institution granting each, and the year in which each was obtained.

Degree	Institution	Year

2. Please list all schools, colleges or universities where you have been employed full-time (beyond the level of teaching or research assistant) along with the years of employment at each.

Institution	Year(s)

3. Have you held a full-time research position outside academe for one or more years after earning your bachelor's degree? ______YES ______NO

4. How many years have you held your present rank? ____________________________

5. Please circle your present rank.

   Instructor
   Assistant professor
   Associate professor
   Professor
   Distinguished "named" professorship
   Lecturer
   Other

6. Please circle the kind of appointment which you now hold.

   Regular with tenure
   Regular without tenure
   Yearly appointment (soft money)
   Acting
   Visiting
   Other

7. (If tenured) In what year were you awarded tenure? ____________

8. During the present term, how many hours per week, on the average, are you actually spending in connection with your staff position in each of the following activities?

Administration. . . . . ____________
Scheduled teaching (actual hours in class). . ____________
Preparing for teaching (including grading papers, grading) . . . . ____________
Advising and counseling students. . . . . . . ____________
Research and scholarly writing. . . . . ____________

9. How many books or monographs have you published or edited, alone or in collaboration? ____________

10. How many articles have you published in academic or professional journals? ____________

11. How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last two years?

Books. . . . . . ____________
Articles . . . . ____________
Other writings . ____________

12. How many papers have you delivered at professional meetings during the last two years? ____________

13. Have you ever received research funding from any source? ______YES ______NO

14. Have you ever worked as a paid consultant? ______YES ______NO

15. Some faculty members are inclined to think of themselves as "intellectuals." Others find "scholar," "scientist," "teacher," or "professional" more satisfactory descriptors. Which of these terms describes you best? ____________________
Which is the poorest descriptor? ____________________

16. Do your interests lie primarily in research or in teaching?

Very heavily in research
In both, but leaning toward research
In both, but leaning toward teaching
Very heavily in teaching

II. Biographical Data

1. Are you a U. S. citizen? ______YES ______NO

2. What is your marital status?

Never married
Married, living with spouse
Married, separated from spouse
Divorced
Widowed

3. Do you have children? ______YES ______NO
(If yes) What are their ages? ______________________________

4. How old are you? _________

5. What is your spouse's occupation at present? ______________________________

6. What was your father's occupation when you were in high school?
____

III. Possible Problems Inventory

Here is a list of 58 possible problems which you may face in teaching within this department. The list has been drawn from the popular and sociological literatures on higher education so individual statements may not be true in this department at this college. Furthermore, even when a statement is true, you may not consider it to be even a slight problem, much less a major one.

For each of the statements below please indicate by circling the appropriate response: First, whether you feel the statement is true (T) or false (F) and second, whether you consider it to be no problem (NP), a slight problem (SP) or a major problem (MP). At the time of the interview I will go over the list with you and give you the opportunity to explain your answers.

1. Graduate training prepared me for research, not teaching. T F / NP SP MP

2. Within this department, undergraduate teaching has low prestige relative to research and publication. T F / NP SP MP

3. Collective bargaining has not been very effective in resolving my most pressing professional problems. T F / NP SP MP

4. One seldom achieves professional recognition for excellence in teaching undergraduates. T F / NP SP MP

5. Educational theory and research are useless as guides for professors who are trying to become better teachers. T F / NP SP MP

6. Professors at research universities seem to look down upon professors at this college. T F / NP SP MP

7. Career opportunities in this academic field are very limited. T F / NP SP MP

8. My discipline is a "low consensus" field--one in which no single paradigm is clearly dominant. T F / NP SP MP

9. The demands of my professional life often interfere with my private life. T F / NP SP MP

10. Because my regular salary is so low, I find it necessary to supplement my income by taking on additional work. T F / NP SP MP

11. Administrative directives, rules and regulations prevent me from teaching the way I would under ideal conditions. T F / NP SP MP

12. My upper-division classes are too large to permit the individualized instruction that I would like to offer. T F / NP SP MP

13. Departmental criteria for achieving promotion and/or tenure are ambiguous. T F / NP SP MP

14. No one at this college shares my specialized professional interests. T F / NP SP MP

15. Departmental recommendations regarding promotions and tenure decisions are often overturned by the administration. T F / NP SP MP

16. Professors here are pressured to relax standards in order to keep students from flunking out. T F / NP SP MP

17. I am often obliged to teach courses which are peripheral to my scholarly interests. T F / NP SP MP

18. It's hard to know just how important research and publication are considered to be by the administration. T F / NP SP MP

19. Our departmental course offerings are poorly organized and coordinated. T F / NP SP MP

20. Maintaining enrollments is a matter of overriding concern within this department. T F / NP SP MP

21. The teaching load makes it difficult for me to keep up with my field. T F / NP SP MP

22. Even an outstanding young professor would have little chance of achieving promotion and tenure. T F / NP SP MP

23. In the great majority of cases, a professor cannot know whether or not he/she has had a real impact upon the students. T F / NP SP MP

24. Students tend to avoid demanding courses whenever possible. T F / NP SP MP

25. Many students here are inadequately prepared for college level work. T F / NP SP MP

26. Students seldom take advantage of my office hours. T F / NP SP MP

27. Student evaluations of teaching are taken too seriously here. T F / NP SP MP

28. The social life on campus interferes with academic achievement. T F / NP SP MP

29. Students generally refuse to accept responsibility for their own failures. T F / NP SP MP

30. Teaching can be quite discouraging because despite one's best efforts, some students simply do not learn the material. T F / NP SP MP

31. The students vary so much in terms of motivation, interest and ability that it is very hard to teach large classes. T F / NP SP MP

32. Cheating is widespread among students. T F / NP SP MP

33. After a few years, teaching loses much of its challenge and excitement. T F / NP SP MP

34. Student abuse of drugs and alcohol interferes with their studies. T F / NP SP MP

35. Many students here are too vocationally oriented. T F / NP SP MP

36. Very few students are truly independent learners. T F / NP SP MP

37. Students often attempt to flatter their professors in an attempt to get high grades. T F / NP SP MP

38. The younger faculty members tend to approach their professional duties quite differently then the oldtimers. T F / NP SP MP

39. Because their interests overlap, professors in this department compete for the privilege of offering certain specialized courses. T F / NP SP MP

40. Some very popular teachers are charlatans. T F / NP SP MP

41. One or more of my departmental colleagues displays minimal commitment to the department and/or college. T F / NP SP MP

42. Professors in this department are reluctant to offer unsolicited advice or criticisms to any of their colleagues. T F / NP SP MP

43. Morale among my departmental colleagues is very low. T F / NP SP MP

44. The unpleasant departmental duties are not shared equally. T F / NP SP MP

45. This department is clearly divided into cliques or factions. T F / NP SP MP

46. Wherever possible, professors avoid discussion of controversial issues. T F / NP SP MP

47. There is very little teamwork and cooperation within this department. T F / NP SP MP

48. There are substantial disagreements among department members over philosophical and/or ideological issues related to teaching. T F / NP SP MP

49. New professors must "sink or swim" on their own without guidance from experienced colleagues. T F / NP SP MP

50. Professors in this department are reluctant to show their displeasure when one of their colleagues has failed to act in a professional mannaer. T F / NP SP MP

51. Opportunities for in-depth discussion of educational issues with my departmental colleagues are rare. T F / NP SP MP

52. Professors seldom discuss teaching problems, materials or techniques outside of department meetings. T F / NP SP MP

53. There are substantial disagreements among department members over teaching methods. T F / NP SP MP

54. Professors in this department cannot seem to agree to "live and let live." T F / NP SP MP

55. We do not have clear and agreed upon departmental criteria to guide collegial evaluations of teaching. T F / NP SP MP

56. One or more of my colleagues is a "rate-buster" whose extra work makes the rest of us look bad. T F / NP SP MP

57. Some departments compete for student enrollments by giving easy grades. T F / NP SP MP

58. Departmental colleagues cannot be counted on to offer social support when teaching troubles arise. T F / NP SP MP

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. What are the most serious problems that you face as an undergraduate instructor in this department?

2. Here is a list of 30 possible problems which you may face in teaching within this department. The list has been drawn from the popular and sociological literatures on higher education so individual statements may not be true here. Furthermore, even when a statement is true, you may not consider it to be even a slight problem, much less a major one.

   For each of the statements below please indicate by circling the appropriate response: First, whether you feel the statement is true (T) of false (F) and second, whether you consider it to be no problem (NP), a slight problem (SP) or a major problem (MP). After you are done I will go over the list with you and give you the opportunity to explain your answers.

3. Are there any other important problems not on the list?

4. a. How do you as an individual attempt to cope with this problem?

   b. How do others in your department attempt to cope with this problem?

   c. What are considered to be the preferred coping strategies?

   d. What coping strategies are considered to be inappropriate?

5. From all that I can gather there appears to be considerable variation among both students and faculty. How would you describe

a. the best students?	a. the best professors?
b. the average student?	b. the average professor?
c. the worst students?	c. the worst professors?

6. How often do you talk about teaching problems?

   With whom do you discuss such problems?

   With whom would you not want to discuss such problems? Why?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Astin, A.W. and Calvin B.T. Lee. "Current Practices in the Evaluation and Training of College Teachers." *Improving College Teaching*. Edited by Calvin B.T. Lee. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Baldridge, J.V. *Power and Conflict in the University*. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Baldridge, J.V. "Diversity in Higher Education: Professional Autonomy." *Journal of Higher Education*, vol. XLVIII, 4 (July/August 1977), 367-388.

Baldridge, J. V., *et*. *al*. *Policy Making and Effective Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978.

Barnard, C.I. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Bassis, M.S. "The Campus as a Frog Pond: A Theoretical and Empirical Reassessment." *American Journal of Sociology*, 1977, 82, 1318-1326.

Bayer, Alan E. *Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972.

Becker, Howard S. "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher." *American Journal of Sociology*, 57 (March 1952), 470-471.

Becker, Howard S. and others. *Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Becker, Howard S. "Personal Change in Adult Life". *Sociometry*, 27, 1 (March 1964), 40-53.

Becker, Howard S., Blanche Geer and Everett C. Hughes. *Making the Grade: The Academic Side of College Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

Ben-David, Joseph. *American Higher Education: Directions Old and New*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Ben-David, Joseph. *Centers of Learning: Britain, France, Germany and the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.

Bidwell, Charles. "The School as a Formal Organization" Handbook of Organizations. Edited by James G. March. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Bidwell, Charles. "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client-Serving Organizations." Organizations and Clients. Edited by William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merril Publishing Company. 1970.

Blackburn, Robert T. "The Meaning of Work in Academia" Assessing Faculty Effort. Edited by James I. Doi. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Publishers, 1974.

Blackburn, Robert T. and others. Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education. Berkeley, Calif.: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976.

Blank, Rolf. "An Organizational Model of Higher Education Institutions and Faculty Teaching Goals." Sociological Inquiry, 48, 1 (1978).

Blau, Peter M. The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Blau, Peter M. and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Fair Practices in Higher Education. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Clark, Burton R. "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Vlaues," American Sociological Review, 21 (June 1956) 326-36.

Clark, Burton R. "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education." American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 569-576.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Culture," The Study of Campus Cultures. Edited by Terry F. Lunsford. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Clark, Burton R. and Trow, M. "The Organizational Context." College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research. Edited by T.M. New comb and E.K. Wilson. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Clark, Burton R., The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed and Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1970.

Clark, Burton R., Academic Power in Italy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1977.

Clark, Burton R., "The Cooling-Out Function Revisited." New Driections for Community Colleges: Questioning the Community College Role. no. 32. Edited by G.B. Vaughan. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Davis, J.A. "The Campus as a Frog Pond: An Application of the Theory of Relative Deprivation to Career Decisions of Colelge Men." American Journal of Sociology. 1966, 72, 17-31.

Davis, J.A., "What College Teachers Value in Students." College Board Review, (Spring 1965): 15-18.

Dornbusch, Sanford M. and W. Richard Scott. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Dornbusch, Sanford. "A Theory of Evaluation Applied to Schools." Speech delivered to the Sociological Research Association, New York City, September 1, 1976.

Dreeben, Robert. "The School as a Workplace." Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Edited by Robert M.W. Travers. Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally, 1973.

Dressel, Paul L. Handbook of Academic Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Etzioni, A. The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Fiske, E.B. "Job-Training Schools Grow Along with Cries of Abuses." New York Times, July 24, 1979, pp. A-1, B-2.

Fiske, E.B. "State Seeks Tighter Control of Vocational Education Education." New York Times. July 27, 1979, pp. B-1, 4.

Fiske, E.B. "The Marketing of the Colleges." Atlantic, (October 1979), pp. 93-98.

Freidson, Elliot. Doctoring Together: A Study of Professional Social Control. New York: Elsevier, 1975.

Fulton, Oliver and Martin Trow, "Students and Teachers: Some General Findings of the Carnegie Commission Survey," *Teachers and Students: Aspects of American Education*. Edited by Martin Trow. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1975.

Gaff, J.G. and R.J. Wilson. "Faculty Cultures and Interdisciplinary Studies." *Journal of Higher Education*, 42 (March 1971), 186-201.

Galbraith, J. *Designing Complex Organizations*. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Gamson, Z.F. "Utilitarian and Normative Orientations Toward Education." *Sociology of Education*, 39 (1966), 346-73.

Gamson, Z.F. "Performance and Personalism in Student-Faculty Relations." *Sociology of Education*, 40, (1967), 279-301.

"Getting Testy: The Rebellion Gathers Steam." *Time*, November 26, 1979, pp. 11-17.

Glazer, N. "The Schools of the Minor Professions." *Minerva*, 12, (1974), 346-364.

Glenney, L.A. "Demographic and Related Issues for Higher Education in the 1980's." *Journal of Higher Education*, 51, 4(1980), 363-380.

Goode, William J. "Community Within a Community: The Professions," *American Sociological Review*, XXII (February 1957), 194-200.

Gouldner, Alvin. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1954.

Gouldner, Alvin "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles-1." *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2 (December 1957), 281-306.

Grant, Gerald and David Riesman. *The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Gusfield, Joseph and David Riesman. "Academic Standards and the 'Two Cultures' in the Context of a New State College." *School Review*. 74 (Spring 1966), 95-116.

Hartnett, Rodney T. and Joseph Katz. "The Education of Graduate Students." *Journal of Higher Education*, XLVIII, 6 (Nov./Dec. 1977).

Hermanowitz, H.J. "The Pluralistic World of Beginning Teachers." *The Real World of the Beginning Teacher*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Hind, R.R., S.M. Dornbusch and W.R. Scott. "A Theory of Evaluation Applied to a University Faculty." *Sociology of Education*, 46 (Winter 1974).

Hughes, Everett C. *The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968.

Johnson, David W. *The Social Psychology of Education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Katz, Joseph and Rodney T. Harnett, eds. *Scholars in the Making*. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger, 1976.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Kozma, Robert B. "Faculty Development and the Adoption and Diffusion of Classroom Innovation." *Journal of Higher Education*, 48, 5 (1978), 438-449.

Ladd, Everett C. and Seymour Martin Lipset. *The Divided Academy*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Ladd, Everett C, Jr. and Seymour Martin Lipset. "Faculty Views on Unions." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, XVI, 3 (May 30, 1978).

Ladd, Everett C. Jr. "The Work Experience of American College Professors: Some Data and an Argument." Paper delivered at the 1979 Annual Conference of the AAHE, Washington, D.C., April 16-19, 1979.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. *The Academic Mind*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1958.

Lee, C. *Improving College Teaching*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

Lerner, B. "The War on Testing: David, Goliath, & Gallup." Public Interest, no. 60 (Summer 1980), 119-147.

Levy, Gerald. Ghetto School: Class Warfare in an Elementary School. New York: Western, 1970.

Licklider, Roy E. "Faculty Ethics in an Academic Depression." Disorders in Higher Education. Edited by Clarence C. Walton and Frederick DeW. Dolman. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.

Liebert, Roland and Alan E. Bayer, "Goals in Teaching Undergraduates: Professional and Client Centeredness." The American Sociologist, 10 (1975), 195-205.

Light, Donald W., Jr. "Introduction: The Structure of the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education, 47, no. 1 (1974), 2-28.

Little, Roger, W. "Buddy Relations and Combat Performance." The New Military. Edited by Morris Jonowitz. New York: Russell Sage, 1964.

London, H. The Culture of a Community College. New York: Praeger, 1978.

London, H. "In Between: The Community College Teacher." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, (March, 1980), 62-73.

Lortie, D.C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. Edited by A. Etzioni. New York: Free Press, 1969.

Lortie, D.C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Mann, Richard D. et. al. The College Classroom: Conflict, Change and Learning. New York: JOhn Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1968.

March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

McHenry, Dean E. Academic Departments. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

McKeachie, W. J. Research on College Teaching: A Review. Report 6. Washington, D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse on Higher Education, George Washington University, 1970.

McKeachie, W. J. and James A. Kulik. "Effective College Teaching." Review of Research in Education. Edited by Fred N. Kerlinger. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, Publishers, 1975.

McPherson, Gertrude H. Small Town Teacher. Cambridge, Mass." Harvard University Press, 1972.

Meeth, L.R. "The Celebration of Effective Teaching." Change Magazine, (February 1976) 44-45.

Meeth, L.R. "The Danger of Teaching Too Well." Change Magazine, (March 1976) 2-3.

Meeth Richard. "The Stateless Art of Teaching Evaluation." Change Magazine, 6,8 (July 1976) 3-5.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Moore, R. "Structure of Faculty Attitudes Toward the University Teacher's Role: A Factor Analytic Study." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30 (1970), 293-99.

Morgan, R.H., "The Conflict Between Teaching and Research in the Academic Role." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.

Moskos, Charles C., Jr. The American Enlisted Man. New York: Russell Sage, 1970.

Newberry, Janet M. "What Teachers Know (and Don't Know) About Each Other," Education Canada, 17,2 (Summer 1977), 36-40.

Newman, Frank. Report on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Page, Charles H. "Bureaucracy's Other Face." Social Forces, 25 (1946-47), 88-94.

Parelius, Ann P. and Robert J. Parelius. The Sociology of Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Parker, G.T. The Writing on the Wall: Inside Higher Education in America. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1979.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald Platt. The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study. Grant GS513. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1968.

Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. Glenview, IL.: Scott Foresman and Company, 1972.

Platt, Gerald, M. "Theory and Practice in the Use of Survey Methods: The Case of the Academic Profession." Studies on Academics and Modes of Inquiry. Edited by Robert T. Blackburn. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1978.

Platt, Gerald M., Talcott Parsons and Rita Kirshstein. "Undergraduate Teaching Environments: Normative Orientations to Teaching Among Faculty in the Higher Educational System." Sociological Inquiry, 48, 1 (1978), 3-21.

Riesman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1956.

Riesman, David and Joseph Gusfield. "Faculty Cultures and Academic Careers." Sociology of Education, 37 (Summer 1964), 281-305.

Riesman, David, Joseph Gusfield and Zelda Gamson. Academic Values and Mass Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Riesman, David. "The Future of Diversity in a Time of Retrenchment." Higher Education, no 4, (1975), 461-482.

Riesman, David. On Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Roethlisberger, F.J. and William J. Dickson. Management and the Worker. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Roy, D.F. "Quota Restriction and Goldbricking in a Machine Shop," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (1952): 427-442.

Sanford, Nevitt. "Academic Culture and the Teacher's Development." Soundings, (Winter 1971), 357-371.

Shils, E. and Morris Janowitz. "Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II." Public Opinion Quarterly, 12 (1948), 280-315.

Shils, Edward. "Intellectuals, Tradition and the Tradition of Intellectuals: Some Preliminary Considerations." *Daedalus*, 101 (Spring 1972) 21-34.

Shils, E. *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Shils, E. "The Academic Ethos." *American Scholar*, 47 (1977), 165-190.

Shore, Jane E. "Faculty Evaluation in Higher Education." *The Generator*. 8,3 (Fall 1978).

Smelser, Neil J. and Gabriel Almond, eds., *Public Higher Education in California*. Berkeley, Calif: University of

Smelser, Neil J. "Growth, Structural Change and Conflict in California Public Higher Education, 1950-1970." *Public Higher Education in California*. Edited by Neil J. Smelser and Gabriel Almond. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press, 1974.

Stark, Joan S. and Barry R. Morstain. "Educational Orientations of Faculty in Liberal Arts Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education*, 49, no. 5 (1978), 420-37.

Stouffer, Samuel A. *The American Soldier*, Vol. II. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1949.

Stroup, H. *Bureaucracy in Higher Education*. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Sumner, William Graham. *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn, 1907.

Thielens, Wagner. "Liberalism and the Professoriate." *Studies on Academics and Modes of Inquiry*. Edited by Robert T. Blackburn. Ann Arbor, Mighigan: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1978.

Touraine, A. *The Academic System in American Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Trow, Martin and Oliver Fulton. "Research Activity in American Higher Education." *Teachers and Students*. Edited by Martin Trow. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

Trow, M. "Departments as Contexts for Teaching and Learning." Academic Departments: Problems, Variations, and Alternatives. Edited by D.E. McHenry and Associates, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Tuckman, H.P. and S. Leahy. "What is an Article Worth?" Journal of Political Economy, 83 (1975), 951-69.

Tuckman, Barbara and Howard P. Tuckman. "The Structure of Salaries at American Universities." Journal of Higher Education, XLVII, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 1976), 51-64.

Tuckman, Howard P. and Robert G. Hagemann. "An Analysis of the Reward Structure in Two Disciplines." Journal of Higher Education, XLVII, no. 4 (July/Aug. 1976).

Tussman, Joseph, Experiment at Berkeley. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Vreeland, Rebecca S. and Charles E. Bidwell. "Classifying University Departments: An Approach to the Analysis of their Effects Upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes." Sociology of Education, 39 (Summer 1966) 237-354.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Warren, Richard L. "Context and Isolation: The Teaching Experience in an Elementary School." Human Organization, 34,2 (Summer 1975), 139-48.

Weick, Karl E. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly, 21 (March 1976), 1-19.

Wheeler, Stanton. "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings." Socialization After Childhood. Edited by Orville Brim, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Wilson, R.C., et. al. College Professors and Their Impact on Students. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.